Universal Redemption

OF

Mankind,

BY THE

Lord Jesus Christ:

Stated and Cleared by the late Learned Mr. **Richard Baxter.**

Whereunto is added a short Account of **Special Redemption,** by the same Author.

---

2 Cor. 5. 14, 15. *For the love of Christ constraineth us because we thus judge, that if one dyed for all, then were all dead, and that he dyed for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which dyed for them, and rose again.*

Mors Christi in Sacra Scripturâ proponitur ut Universale remedium omnibus & singulis hominibus exordiatione Dei & naturâ rei ad salutem applicabile. *Davenant* de morte Christi.

LONDON. Printed for John Salusbury at the Rising-Sun in Cornhill, 1694.

THE

Epiſtle Dedicatory.

To the Honoured *Thomas Foley*, *Paul Foley*, *Phillip Foley*, and *William Jolliff*, Eſquires.

Worthy Sirs,

MY particular Relation to your Honoured Father, my Worthy Patron and Benefactor, as alſo to Mr. *Baxter*, the Author of theſe enſuing Diſputations, (whom I cannot but own as a Spiritual Father to me, and the beſt Friend I had in the World) gives me occaſion to prefix your Names to this Book: Not to flatter you (though I truly honour you for your Faithfulneſs, Courage, and Conſtancy in aſſerting the Rights of Religion and Property in oppoſition to the prophane and mercenary deſigns of ſuch as appeared againſt them) but that by *their Example* I may invite you to go on in filling up the meaſure of your Fathers Vertues, and in following the Counſels of ſuch a Miniſter of Chriſt, whoſe gifts and graces gave him the preeminence amongſt his Suffering Bre-

thren, and made him more than a Bishop even of the first Magnitude to the Inferiour Clergy. Your Father is dead long since, and Mr. *Baxter* is dead also; *But the Memory of the Just is blessed*, whereas *the name of the Wicked shall rot*. The Righteous shall be in everlasting remembrance. We cannot easily forget such Persons whose good works and great labours for publick good, have left them a Name better than of Sons and Daughters. A numerous Posterity is a great Blessing, a Holy Seed much greater, that the Blessing upon both accounts may be entailed upon you and yours to many Generations, is the hearty desire of

Yours in the Service of Christ

JOSEPH READ.

READER.

READER.

June 27. 1694.

HAving been assured from Mr. *Baxter* himself, both by word and writeing, that he had given this his Treatise in Manuscript of *Universal Redemption*, &c. to Mr. *Joseph Read* the now Publisher thereof; and having seen some of the Manuscript it self whilst it was printing off, and knowing it to be Mr. *Baxter*'s own hand writing; I do (at Mr. *Read*'s request) assure thee that this is the Treatise upon that Subject, which hath been so long desired and expected by the World from the Author thereof, Mr. *R. B.* And I cannot doubt but that an Impartial and observant Reading thereof will quickly discover that *acumen* of judgment which will evince it to be his. Thine in the best of Bonds and Services,

MAT. SYLVESTER

To the READER.

IT is neceſſary that I give ſome Account how theſe Diſputations (with many others) came to my hands, and of their Publication. Being ſent to Cambridge by Mr. Baxter, he was pleaſed at my return from thence, to receive me into his Family, and to make uſe of me as his Aſſiſtant at my firſt entrance into the Miniſtry, Anno, 1657. in Kidderminſter the place of my Birth: Some of the firſt work he put me upon was to tranſcribe theſe Papers of Redemption, which he deſigned for the Preſs. The Miniſters of Worceſterſhire and Neighbourhood thereabouts who uſually attended on his Thurſday Lecture, and heard theſe Diſputations at their Monthly Meeting, were generally deſirous to have them Printed. Mr. B. had long ſince raiſed their expectation thereof, by declaring his intention of it in Print: At laſt (though long firſt) viz. July 17. 1691. he gave them to me, ſignifying his willingneſs to have them Printed.

If any Perſon queſtion whether he wrote and fitted theſe Sheets for the Preſs, I ſhall readily ſatisfie him by producing the Original of his own hand writing, as well as the Copy thereof wrote by me at leaſt 38 years ſince. If theſe Diſputations of Redemption find acceptance (which I ſee no cauſe to doubt of) I ſhall be thereby incouraged to Print the reſt, or ſuch of them as may be thought moſt uſeful.

It

It was a great word of Bishop Wilkins, *that Mr.* Baxter had cultivated every Subject he handled, *(read this Subject of Redemption, and judge whether there be not cause to say so of it)* if he had lived in the Primitive times, he had been one of the Fathers of the Church. *And again,* It was enough, *saith he,* for one Age to produce such a Person as Mr. *Baxter: But his works praise him much more than the Tongues or Pens of the greatest Doctors or best of Men can do. There is therefore no need of Letters of Recommendation to set forth the excellence of this Work, or the Praises of the Author thereof. Let it suffice to assure the Reader that this Disputation of Universal Redemption was composed by him in the strength of* his day, *about the* 40th *year of his Age, when the opposition of the Learned of differing Opinions had sharpen'd his Pen, and made him extreamly exact in considering what he intended for the Press. That which I earnestly desire is, that* young Ministers, *and especially all* Candidates for the Ministry *would put on humbleness of mind, and set themselves at the feet of this* Great Man *as Learners, and then through the Divine Blessing, I doubt not but their profiting will appear unto all men: And let those of different Judgment from him, but remember, that Mr.* Baxter now dead *is as much above their clamorous censures, as* while living *he was their Superiour in his Gifts and Graces: Had the one or the other but known Mr.* Baxter, *as well as others of his familiar Friends, his Works would be highly valued by them; or at least his* unspotted Holiness, *and* great Charity *would so far have conciliated their minds, and engaged their affections as to love and honour his memory, and imitate* his Life, *which*

we

we impatiently wait for an account of from another hand, being now ready for the Press. May every Minister but have that Book when Printed, and lay aside prejudice so far, at least as calmly to read it, and then I may with confidence expect, not only, that humble Learners, but the greatest Scholars will be as desirous of acquaintance with his Works as ever Usher, Gataker, Vines, *and many others of the best of men were admirers of his Personal worth, and desirous of his Converse and Company.*

If any shall be so far dissatisfied with the Title and Subject of the Book as to throw it aside, I only desire they would seriously think of those words, p. 286. [When God saith so expresly that Christ dyed for all, and tasted death for every man, and is the Ransom for all, and the propitiation for the sins of the whole World, it beseems every Christian rather to explain in what sense Christ dyed for all men, than flatly to deny it.] *And let me add those words of Bishop* Usher;

Distinguish between the satisfaction of Christ absolutely considered, and the application of the same unto every one in particular: The former was once done for all, the other is still in doing; the one brings with it sufficiency abundant to discharge the whole debt, the other adds unto it efficacy. The Universality of the satisfaction derogates nothing from the special grace; neither the speciality of the one, abateth the generality of the other.

The Lord give us a right understanding of his mind and will, and bless this work of the Author, both to Ministers and their People, that the common Salvation *may not be narrowed or lessen'd, that* Coming Souls *may not be discouraged, and that the Gospel of Salvation which we Preach may be Tydings of Joy to all People, and then I shall not repent my part in the Publication thereof.*

June 18. 1694.

JOSEPH READ.

OF

Universal Redemption.

Chap. 1. *The General Question,*

Whether Christ Died for All Men, and not only for the Elect? Aff.

THough, according to the Order of our Disputations, I must directly Affirm or Deny; and indeed may safely Affirm as the Question is thus generally put, yet that it may be understood in what sense I affirm it, it is necessary that those ambiguities be removed, which, in some of the terms do cloud the sense, and that the nature of the Subject be somewhat opened. And indeed, it is a clear Explication that is most necessary in this Controversie; that we may not (as is here usual) fight in the dark, and trouble our selves with unuseful Argumentations, on an ill stated question, and in dubious terms; not knowing each others mind, if well our own.

Who is meant by [*Christ*] we are all agreed: and who by [*Men:*] and that therefore we extend not the Question to *Angels*, though that with some be a great dispute, whether Christ dyed not in some

sort for them. By his [*Dying*] we mean, *His whole Humiliation*, of which his *Death* is so principal a part; that as the Scripture takes most notice of it, so must we. *Amesius* thinketh that the *Assumption of the Human Nature*, is no part of this Humiliation; his reason is, because it was an Act of the *Sole Deity*: And the *Godhead* cannot suffer. But I think we need not be of that Opinion; For, 1. The Holy Ghost seems to me to contradict it, making it part of Christs Humiliation, *To make himself of no Reputation and take upon him the form of a Servant, and be made in the likeness of Men*, when he was in the *form of God*, and *equal with God*, Phil. 2. 6, 7. 2. And though the Godhead cannot suffer the *Loss* of any *Real Good*, or *suffer any Pain*, yet in a *Relative Sense* he may be said to *suffer* while he is *disesteemed* and *dishonoured*. Mans *Obedience addeth nothing* to him, nor can it properly be said to *do Good* to God; yet is it in *Bonum Dei Reputativè* as *Aquin.* speaks: It is *Good and due to God from us*; and when we deny it him, we deprive him of *his due*: Gods Glory is dear to him, or else Divines would not so use to affirm it his *Sole End*: (which saying yet needs Caution:) And as *Relative* and *Reputative* he enjoyeth and delighteth in his Honour and our Praises as good, so *Relative* and *Reputative* he *suffereth* when he is *Dishonoured*. And so the *Condescention* was so great (indeed to the astonishment of Angels and Men,) that it may well be taken for part of Christs *Suffering*; that God should by assuming so mean a Nature, become *Man*: It is the point that so surpasseth Human Reason, and seemeth so improbable to it, that it puts Faith harder to it, (and consequently ennobleth it more) than

than any other in the World; which occasioned the whole Moral work of Faith, containing divers Physical Acts; to be all entitled or denominated hence, by the name of *Belief*. So that I am readier to think that the *Eclipsing* of the *Glory* of the *Godhead* in so strange a *Condescention* and *Humility*, not only in his *Assumption* of the *Human Nature*, but in the *Life and Death* of Christ, was the *greatest part* of his *Sufferings*: And am so far from thinking that the *Godhead* did *not Suffer*, that I think *its Sufferings* were the *chiefest* for *merit*; though in a *Natural Sense* it be uncapable of suffering.

But a greater Ambiguity lieth in the Word [*All.*] [*All*] is taken sometime *limitedly* and *improperly* for the *multitude* or *very many*, as in *Mat.* 2. 3. and 3. 5. *Mar.* 1. 32, 33. *Acts* 5. 12. *&c.* 2. Sometime *properly*, according to the different subjects. Sometime it is spoken of *All kinds* only, as of *All Ages*, *Sexes*, *Estates*, *Degrees*, *Nations*, *Conditions* of Men: Sometime of *All Persons*, and then if it be [*All*] in proper speech we need not expect that [*Every one*] should be added; for *All Persons* and *Every Person*, are equivalent. And though our Question be of [*All*] in this last proper sense, yet principally as contradistinguished from the *Elect only*: And I had rather far so take it here, as referring only to those that have heard the Gospel. Not that I doubt at all of *Christs Dying for every Man*, so far as we shall anon explain. But 1: Because the case is more clearly opened in Scripture: 2. And much more concerneth us to know, *How God dealeth with those to whom Christ is revealed, than with those to whom he is not revealed.* God speaks both *little*

and *more darkly* of the State of those to whom he speaks *not*; seeing it concerneth us not to know his Counsels about others, so much as about our selves. Those therefore who in all disputes on this Question, do still insist on the Case of *Infants* and *Pagans* to whom Christ was never revealed, to prove that he *Dyed not for All*, do plainly shew, that they seek not the *clearing* of the point, and manifestation of the truth, but the Obscuring of it. It being the usual trick of men that are at a loss, and can carry on their Cause no farther, to argue presently *à minus noto, & ad obscurum ab obscuriore*, that so they may carry the business into a mist, which will not endure the light, and so may bring their Antagonists to grope; the weakest having the most disadvantage in the dark. If it had much concerned us to know on what terms the Indians are judged that never heard of Christ, the Scripture would have said more of it; and not have fitted the description of the Judicial process *wholly*, or *almost wholly* to the state of those that have heard the Gospel, *Mat.* 25. 2 *Thes.* 1.6,7,8,*&c.* So that I desire to handle this Question now, as it concerneth all those that have heard the Gospel, knowing no great use (but some hurt) that may be in the extending it farther in our dispute; yet with those that are contentious, and will needs insist on the supposed advantage which the state of Indians and other Pagans and their Infants do afford them, I shall though unwillingly, proceed further, rather than prejudice the Truth.

But the greatest Ambiguity in our Question is in the term [*For.*] This proposition here may admit of divers Senses: Sometime Christ is said

to

to *Die* [*For*] *our Sins*: Sometimes *To Die* [*For*] *us*; When he is said to *Die* [*For*] *our Sins*, it may be understood, 1. Either *for our Sins as the pro Meritorious procuring Cause of his Suffering* through his own undertaking to bear what they deserved: (Or if any think it fitter to call them *the Occasion than the Meritorious Cause*, they may.) And so, to *Die* [*For*] *our Sins*, is to *Die* [*through the Desert*] *of our Sins*. 2. Or else he may be said to *Die* [*For*] *our Sins*, *Finaliter*, as Sin is part of the *Evil* which he intended through death to free us from. And so, to Die [*For*] *Sin*, is *To Die* [*against*] *Sin*: As when we say, *This Medicine is good* [*For*] *such a Disease*; we mean *it is good* [*against it.*]

When Christ is said to *Die* [*For us*] it may be meant either, 1. *Subjectivè* that he Died *Loco nostro* (of which more anon,) 2. Or *Finaliter*; And that two ways, 1. Either as we are to be his own in *propriety*; and so 1. To be a means to *his own glory*, 2. Or his *Propriety* a means to our *further good*. And thus he dyeth [*For*] *Men* by way of *purchase*, as a Man gives a *Price* [*For*] a Slave or Condemned Malefactor, (for I will not say, as we buy a *Beast* in the Market, seeing that is only *for our selves*; and not *for the good of the Beast*.) 2. Or else *more directly* as we are the *Finis Cui* of those benefits which by his Death he procureth. And so Dying [*For us*] is either taken *generally*, respecting *our selves generally considered* as the Objects of his love. As one Friend or Lover is said to *Die for the sake* of another in several Cases; as in *fighting for him*, or other way of *signifying* or *testifying Love*: So generally considered Christ Died *nostri gratiâ*. 2. Or in refe-

rence to the *special Benefits* which by his Death he procured [for us.] Which Benefits might be variously considered, either, 1. *As to be offered, or to be enjoyed:* 2. Either *quoad possibilitatem, vel quoad futuritionem possessionis:* 3. *Quoad rem ipsam, vel quoad Jus ad rem:* with divers other Considerations, which I will pass by; lest by needless distinguishing I should rather obscure the point than clear it. Only, before I can go any farther I must needs lay down a few Distinctions which are of great moment and necessity for the right understanding of this matter. 1. And first and above all, we must both distinguish between the divers *Effects* or *Ends* of Christs Death; and rightly consider the *Reason* and the *Order* of each of them. For to know only in general that *Christ dyed for us*, is so far from being a sufficient knowledge for a Divine, that it is not sufficient to denominate a man a Christian; seeing it saith no more of Christ than may be said of *Stephen*, *Peter*, *Paul*, or one another: For we must, if called to it, die for one another, saith *John*, 1 Epist. 3. 16. Yet I confess the *right ordering* of this whole work in our *Conceivings* is a matter of *great difficulty* though of *great moment*. At the present time will permit me only to give you this brief Account of my thoughts herein.

I Consider, 1. *What Christ did:* 2. *Why he did it.*

1. That which he did was 1. *In sensu Naturali*, to *Suffer* and *Die*. 2. *In sensu Legali vel Morali*, It was, 1. *In General*, to be *Punished*: 2. *In Special*, it was *A voluntary bearing in the person of a Mediator in the stead of fallen Mankind that punishment in weight which for their Sin the Law of works*

Obliged

Obliged them to bear. Or to speak in the Scripture phrase (which it were well if men had been contented with) it is the offering himself a Sacrifice for Sin, and so to take them away as a Ransom for Attonement and Propitiation.

2. *Why Christ did this*, must be answered from the *Efficient* and *Final Causes*. In *general*, *Gods will* is the *Principal Efficient* and *Ultimate Final Cause* of this, and all things. More *particularly*, 1. *God* was the *Author* or *first Cause* in committing this work to his Son, and *sending him* to do it. 2. Gods *Mercy and Compassion* (speaking after the manner of Men) was the *Impulsive Cause*. 3. *Mans misery* was the *Occasion*. 4. *Mans sin* was another occasion, as being *loco Causæ Meritoriæ*; for *properly* there was no *Meritorious Cause*. 5. The *Laws Curse* or *Obligation* was another occasion, as being *Miseriæ Causa removenda*. 6. Christs *Voluntary Sponsion* or *Consent* was the *Moral Obliging Cause*, supplying the place both of a *Meritorious* and of a *Legal Obliging Cause*. 7. *Christ himself* was the *Voluntary Patient*. 8. *God himself* was the *Principal moral Efficient*, so far as it had *rationem boni*: (For he cannot be a *morally deficient* Cause, nor an *Efficient* of Punishment so far as it hath in it *rationem veri mali*.) 9. *Satan* was the *Principal Author* of it, as it *was Evil*. 10. *Wicked men* were the *Instruments*.

2. And for the *Ends* there is two ways of discerning and expressing them. The 1. is according to Gods order of *Intention*. The 2. according to His Order of *Attainment* and *Execution*.

1. The *former* is less fit for our observation both because we are utterly uncertain whether it be *fully* and *wholly revealed*; seeing God may have *Ends* which he judgeth not fit to communicate to us; and where it is not revealed either 1. By *Scripture*; or 2. By *Event*, it is impossible we should know it.

2. And because when we do *see Events*, yet we are so vastly *distant* from God, and exceeding strange to his unconceivable unexpressible Nature, that we know not what hath the place of an *End* and what of a *means* in the *Divine Intention*, farther than *He* hath *told us*: Nor know what Gods intention is, the term being properly appliable only to *Creatures*, and no term of Human Language in strict propriety appliable to the Nature of God.

But this much the Scripture *Revealeth* to us, 1. That in the sense as God may be said to have an end, *Gods proper ultimate end* is *himself*. *He made all things for himself*, and can have no *lower end than himself*. *But how himself* is his *end* is hard to open. If we say, his *Being as such* is his *End*, or that his *Essential Glory* is his *End*; we do but darken the matter and lose our selves. For neither Redemption nor any other work can either cause, conserve or add to that Being and Glory. If we say, *His Glory* in the *Esteem of the Creature* is his utmost *End*, we suppose him to have an *End Infinitely below himself*. If you say, that *the Communication of himself to his Creature* is his *End*, either you speak of the *Acts* of Communication as *in God*, and so it is *himself*; (as before expressed) *Efficiently and not Finally Considered*: Or else you speak of the *form produced by it*, or as *received* by the Creature

Creature; and so it is *quid Creatum & extra Naturam Divinam*, and too low to be his End. I conclude therefore that man is uncapable of a clear and full conceiving of the *Nature of Gods End* or *Intending*. But the *conception* and *expression* which I judge to be *most favoured* by Scripture and Reason is, *That Gods will is the Beginning and End of all things. Whatsoever pleased him, that did he*, And when he hath done it *the pleasing him is his End*. And therefore he *Rested* after the work of *Creation*, and expresseth himself *well pleased by and in his Son in the work of Redemption*, as seeing his work in both to be *very good*: and therefore instituted a day of *Rest* in *Commemoration* of *both*. The term *Rest* expresseth the *End*; and his *Well-pleasedness*, *Content*, or *Will*, is his *Rest*, and so his *End*. (And in this sense God himself is his own *End*,) and indeed this *Pleasing* him should be Mans *End* also.

2. But besides this *Ultimate End*, (though properly God can have *no End but himself*;) yet there are *some means* so closely conjunct with this *End*, as being the *immediate matter* of Gods *Approbation* & *Delight*, that they may not unfitly be called Gods *secondary* or *less principal ends* themselves; especially we may so say in regard of *Christs intentions* who is *Man* as well as *God*. And these are,

1. The Glory, or Image, or Perfections of God, as appearing in all his works; thus his own Power, and Wisdom, and Goodness there shining forth, is that Glory in which he is *well-pleased*, and which he loveth. And thus the Glory of God is *materially only* or objectively his utmost End, as that in which his *Will* doth *Rest*.

2. The

2. The *Glorifying of the Mediator* in his *Human Nature*, and his full satisfaction and content in the fruits of his Redemption.

3. The *Glory* and *Happiness* of his *Elect* who are his Body.

4. Their *Everlasting perfect Praises of God, loving him*, and *rejoycing in him.*

5. And even in *this Life*, the Just, Wise, Merciful Administrations of the Mediator in his Kingdom, and the imperfect Deliverance and Holiness of the Saints, and the glory that redounds to God hereby, may not unfitly be said to be the *Ends* of the Redeemer.

But I will meddle with this *Order of Intention* no farther, as intending God willing, to speak more fully and accurately of that Question *de ordine decretorum, de fine & de mediis* in a fitter place.

2. But let us consider of the *Order* of these *Ends* as *Executed*, I mean of the *Effects* of Christs *Death*. And they are 1. Such as *immediatly* follow it, as it is the *Discharge* of the *Sufferers undertaking*, being indeed, 1. *Part* of his *Work* in its *Moral Consideration*: 2. Or else the *immediate results* of that *Discharge* These are, 1. That Christs Death doth *demonstrate Gods justice and hatred of Sin.* 2. In it an *Example* is given for the *deterring of Offenders.* 3. And for *preserving the Lawgiver*, and the *Law* from *contempt.* 4. And a demonstration made of unspeakable Love to Men. 5. And in and by these, 1. The Lawgiver satisfied. 2. And the chief Ends of the Law are attained: (though we cannot strictly say that the *Law it self is satisfied*, because its *sense* and *nearest end* is not *fulfilled.* Thus *satisfaction of Justice* is)

the

the *sum* of these most *immediate Effects*. And the whole work together may well be called *A Satisfactory Penalty*.

2. *Satisfaction* being thus made, there are *immediately hereupon*, several *Relative Effects resulting* from it. Whereof some are from the *Nature* of the *Work*, (supposing that which is called *The Covenant between the Father and the Son*, that is, *Gods Acceptation*.) And some are given as it were by way of *Retribution*, or in *Communication* to Christ *for his satisfaction*.

Of the *first sort* are these,

1. *Christ himself* is now *free* from his *Voluntary obligation to suffer*. In the same sense as he was *before made Sin*, he is *now Justified*; and upon his *Resurrection declared just*. He *oweth no more*, nor can any more be required of him.

2. The *Father* therefore doth give him an *Acquittance*, and acknowledgeth the satisfaction, proclaiming himself *well-pleased* in his Son.

3. And hereby is Christ become *Conquerour* over *Death*, and *Him who had the Power of Death*, even the *Devil*; (Supposing his Resurrection.)

2. *Satisfaction* is so *pleasing* to God, that upon the *giving* thereof, the work becomes *Meritorious* of *Reward* to the *satisfier*.

1. Because it was not *Due* from *Him*, nor *Compelled*, but *voluntary*.

2. Because (though God be not capable of *receiving good*, yet) it was from his own *earnest desire* which he was moved to by *Compassion to Man*, and so it was *reputative*, *in bonum Dei*, as being pleasing to him.

The *things given* to the *Satisfier* by way of *Retribution* are, 1. Some *directly to himself*, as necessary

to

to the *Ends of Redemption*: 2. Some *for the Sinners* in whose stead he suffered.

To himself is given, 1. Something to be *received before the End* and Delivering up of the Kingdom, and something *after*. *Before he Received*, 1. *Real*, the glorifying of his person. 2. *Relative Fruits*, *Novum jus Dominii*, a full *Propriety* in the Creature as his *own* which he *bought*. And that is, 1. *Over Mankind* whom he *Redeemed*. 2. And *all the Creatures* as they may be *serviceable* to his *Ends*. By his *Propriety in Man* he hath *Power*, 1. To *use* what *means* he seeth meet to perswade them to himself. Either 1. *External*, 1. As the *Word*, or 2. *Works*. 2. Or *Internal*, by his *Spirit*, and their *Conscience*. 2. And to *succeed the means*. By his *Propriety* in *other Creatures*, he hath *Power* to dispose of, 1. *Persons*, both 1. *Angels*, and 2. *Enemies*, as Devils; and 2. *Things*: As 1. *Creatures*, 2. *Actions*, and *Thoughts*, so as many serve his *Ends* of *Redemption*.

2. Beside this *Propriety*, he hath *Novum Jus Imperii*, and is become *Rector* of the *Rational Creature*, whom he Redeemed. This is partly consequential to his *Jus Dominii*: For every Man hath *Power* to *Rule his Own* according to *its Capacity*. By this *Rectorship* Christ hath Power, 1. To *Determine* both 1. What shall be *Due from Man*, 2. And *What shall be Due to him*: Which he doth, 1. *By making Laws de novo*. 2. And *disposing* of the *Old* at his pleasure. And as he hath this power of the *Laws*: So, 2. Of their *Execution*. 1. By Sentence. 2. And by the Execution of the *Sentence*. Thus much of that which *Christ himself* was to *receive for his satisfaction* in *this time* before the End.

2. *After*

2. *After the End* he was further to receive, 1. The *continuation* or *perpetuating* of his *Personal Glory* and *Blessedness*. 2. A full *Content* in the *perfect accomplishment* of his work, 1. In the *just Destruction* of his *Enemies* that rebelled and rejected him. 2. And in the *Blessedness* and *Glory* of his *Saints*, who are his *Body*: and in the *pleasing of God in all*. Thus much of what Christ was to *receive to himself*.

2. That which *Mankind* was to *receive* for whom he satisfied, was 1. *Immediately*, in the change of his Condition; where is Considerable,

1. The *Terminus à quo*, which was, *A Legal necessity of Destruction* or *Damnation*; which consisteth in this, that *now* the *Lawgiver* (*God-Creator*) being *satisfied*, he is no longer *necessitated* or *obliged* (as we may speak) to destroy the Sinner; (tho' yet the Law is not wholly *Abrogate*, nor its *Obligation* of the Sinner to *Duty* or *Punishment* dissolved:) but the *Sinner* is *Delivered* from that *Law* as it *stands alone without a Remedy*, seeing a sufficient Remedy is provided, and the Law it self is now at the pleasure and disposé of the Redeemer, who will Judge no Man by this *Law alone*, or *principally*. So that the Sinner who before was *not pardonable*, but *in potentiâ remotiore* nor *at all quoad Potentiam Dei ordinatam* in his former state, without this change; is now become *pardonable in Potentiâ propriore*, & *quoad Potentiam Dei ordinatam* in his *present* state.

2. The *Terminus ad quem*, or state to which he is Delivered; is,

1. To the *Redeemer* as *Proprietary*, he being his *Own*.

2. To

2. To the *Redeemer as Rector*, to be dealt with on terms of *Grace*, and in order to *Recovery* from his *Misery*.

3. And in both these to the *Redeemer* as our grand Benefactor and Saviour whose Office is to lead us to God by the winning demonstration of his Love.

Mans state having this immediate change of Relation: 2. The *Benefits Consequential* to these which he *receiveth*; are Either, 1. From *Christ as Rector*: Or, 2. As *Dominus absolutus, Proprietary*. 3. And as a free Benefactor doing as he list with his own benefits.

1. As *Rector*, Christ is (as is said) 1. *Legislator*: 2. And seeth to the *Execution*. As *Legislator*, 1. He taketh *down* the *old Law*, both, 1. That of works, as it is a proper covenant and means of Life, and so freeth man from the necessity of perfect obeying for salvation (though yet he destroy not its being or obligation to perfect obedience.) 2. And he freeth those that were under it, from the *Mosaical Law of Rites*, and that by *Abrogating* it (But this was not till the fulness of time, but the other was presently upon the beginning of Restauration.) 2. He [1. *Maketh*, 2. *Promulgateth*] a *New Law of Grace*, containing, 1. Essentials: 2. Accidentals. By the *Essentials* of the Law, 1. He prescribeth to men a sweet and easie Course of Duty, and giveth them commands that are not grievious; which 1. In some respects he maketh meer *Duties* and *Means*: 2. And in other respects, *Conditions* of their receiving farther benefits. 2. He determineth of what shall be *Due to man*, (as by way of *Penalty* if they *Rebel*; so, 1.) By con-

conferring farther benefits on men: Which are Considerable, 1. In themselves: 2. In the way of Collation. 1. The Benefits given by the new Law or Covenant are, 1. *Right* to *relative Benefits* or new Relations. 2. Or Right to *real Benefits*. The former are, 1. *Principal* and *Radical*, that is, Membership of Christ or Union with him. 2. Or *Consequential*: Which are, 1. The fruits of satisfaction, properly as satisfaction; that is, The Restoring us from the misery we fell into, by freeing us from Guilt or Obligation to punishment, by pardoning our Sin, and Justifying us, so far. 2. Those that are *Consequential* to satisfaction, not meerly as satisfaction, but as a *Price Purchasing* or *Meriting* farther good, (and so are consequents of his *Meritorious Works* also.) And that is his bringing us to a higher and better state of Relation than that which was lost; which is in, 1. *Adoption* to Sonship. 2. Membership of the Church of the Redeemed and Called.

2. The *real Benefits* which the Covenant giveth us right to are, 1. Such as are to be received in *this Life*: As 1. The Spirit to be, 1. Our further Sanctifier: 2. And Comforter. 2. And all other things to work for our good, and promote our Recovery and Happiness. 2. Or such as are to be received in the *Life to come*; Either at the Entrance, as, 1. Felicity of the Soul first, and then Resurrection from the Dead. 2. And Justification by sentence and adjudication of Eternal Glory: 2. Or in the state thereof, which is our Perfect Blessedness in Enjoying God, and being perfectly acceptable to him in our Persons, and Praises. We speak not now of these real benefits as *Conferred in themselves*; but in the *Right* we have

have to them before hand: All which *Right* is given by the *New Law or Covenant*, as *Gods Instrument*.

2. And as the benefits given, so the manner of the Laws giving must needs be observed: Which is, 1. By imperfect Collation, not *ipso facto*, presently making the thing our own, which is, 1. When the gift is conditional, suspended on some Condition: And only thus doth the Law or Covenant give Pardon, Justification, Adoption, with all that Right to real Mercy before mentioned; to all men, Elect or not Elect before they believe. 2. Or when the thing is given only *in Diem*. And so Right to a Resurrection is given to all. 2. Or else the Law makes a perfect Collation, and that is, 1. When it gives the Benefit absolutely and presently: So that Christ freed men from the Law of Works and Ceremonies, so far as is before expressed. 2. Or when it actually confers that Benefit after the performance of the Condition, which before was but Conditionally Given. For it was the will of the Legislator that the actual Gift should be suspended on that Condition; and therefore though the Nature of the Law change not upon that performance of the Condition, yet it then begins *Moraliter Efficaciter agere*, which it did not before. And thus the Law of Grace gives actual Pardon, Adoption, and Right to glory, to men as soon as they sincerely believe. And here begin the Effects of Christs death in Law sence, to be peculiar to some; when they perform the conditions which others do not (which condition Christ giveth not as Legislator.) All that we have spoke till now, was common to Non-elect. Thus we

have

have ſhewed what the Law gives by its Eſſentials. 2. By the Integrals or Accidentals (which you will call them) of this new Law; (for Laws uſe to have Preambles, Narratives, *&c.* to inform men of the ground, occaſion, and end of them:) Chriſt doth, 1. Give all men that hear it information or objective diſcovery of whatſoever is neceſſary to be known for attaining the foreſaid benefits: As of God, Chriſt, his Nature, Office, Works, *&c.* 2. He giveth them potent Reaſons, Motives, Perſwaſions, Exhortations, Threatnings, *&c.* to work upon their Wills. And both theſe are Grace and ſufficient in *ſuo genere*. Having ſhewed what Chriſt giveth as Legiſlator, it followeth, 2. That we ſhew what he giveth in Execution of theſe Laws. And that is, 1. In this Life, as was promiſed. 2. After, 1. At Death and by Reſurrection, 2. By Judgment, 1. By Sentence, where as Judge, 1. He Juſtifieth all Believers, 2. Adjudgeth to them Everlaſting Glory; (as he Condemneth their Enemies to Everlaſting Fire: Both Wicked men as Rebels, and Devils as *hoſtes* open Foes.) 2. In Execution of this Sentence he perfecteth them in Glory. So far of Chriſts Benefits which we receive from him as Rector.

2. Next we are to view thoſe which Chriſt gives as free Benefactor, and *Dominus abſolutus* meerly (though yet with reſpect to the Ends of Government.) And ſo, 1. He diſpoſes of the Means. 2. Of the Succeſs. 1. He giveth Means differently as he pleaſe, to ſome more, to ſome leſs. And they are, 1. Outward Means: 2. Inward. The outward are, 1. The Works of God. 2. The Ordinances or Juſtified Means. The

works which are means to teach and win men are. 1. The Creatures themſelves as diſcovering Gods Wiſdom, Power, Goodneſs, and much Mercy to man, ſo much as opened to all Nations that hope of pardon, which was their Encouragement to all that Sacrificing, Prayers, and other Religiouſneſs, which they generally in ſome meaſure uſed, and would never have uſed it, had it not been for this hope, which was grounded in a diſcovery of Gods Mercifulneſs to them, though Sinners. 2. And Providential diſpoſal of Events, much furthers this: 1. In ſeaſonable Afflicting and Puniſhing: 2. In giving the Mercies of Proſperity. 2. The Ordinances or inſtituted means are, 1. His Ordinances ſtrictly ſo called, as, 1. His Laws, Covenants, Doctrine. 2. And his Sacraments. 1. Baptiſm. 2. And the Lords Supper. 2. And the concomitant means. 1. For the divulging of his Word; by 1. Men appointed thereto, 1. Ordinary, as, 1. Miniſters in their places; and 2. Other Chriſtians in theirs. 2. Extraordinary, as Apoſtles and Prophets. 2. And by Artificial means. 1. To the Ear by Speaking, in Teaching and Perſwading by the foreſaid men: 2. To the Eye by Writing, Printing. 2. And as he giveth theſe means for the divulging his word; ſo for the inforcing of it and the ſucceſs that men may Underſtand, Believe and Obey it, he giveth means. 1. Extraordinary, as the Holy Ghoſt to work Miracles.

2. Ordinary, 1. By fellowſhip with one another in ordinary community, whether. 1. With private Chriſtians: 2. Or Miniſters, either of which help us: 1. Either by Example: 2. Or Inſtruction, either, 1. By Conference. 2. Or ſolemn Teaching,

Teaching, 1. By Voice, 2. Or Writing, being gifted, 1. Meanly, 2. Or Eminently, 1. By Nature, 2. Art, Learning, Grace as God is pleased to dispose. 2. Or else these Ordinary helps are from and in Association, and that, 1. In lesser bodies as Families. 2. In greater as, 1. Ecclesiastical Churches: Where we have the benefit, 1. Of the Persons, 1. Officers, 2. Members Common. 2. Of the order and ordinances, discipline, &c. 2. Or Civil Societies, where we have all civil helps to further our Religious Ends.

So much for the Outward Means, Only observe, that I am not now speaking of these as commanded and made due: for so they are not given by Christ as Legislator; but as bestowed and disposed of eventually which is by Christ as a free benefactor, proprietary or *Dominus absolutus*; so far as he doth it without pre-obligation and differently.

2. Next, the Inward Means which Christ giveth thus are. 1. The disposal and ordering of the temper of the Humours and parts of the Body, so as may be more or less fit to receive or retain Impressions. 2. The advantitious helps are. 1. The service of good Angels. 2. Above all the Holy Ghost, to work in that season, manner and measure as to his Wisdom seems meet.

So much of the Benefits which Christ giveth as free Benefactor and as *Dominus* by way of *Means*. 2. Lastly, He also *succeedeth* these means variously as he pleaseth. 1. To some for the Endowing them only with Common Gifts. 1. Extraordinary, as working Miracles. 2. Ordinary, as 1. Intellectual, in the knowledge, 1. Of Arts and Sciences; 2. Or of more Divine Truth. 2. Or Moral, either

either, 1. In Civility and common Honesty toward Men; with excellent quallifications, as Meekness. Patience, &c. 2. Or Religiousness or Piety toward God; which is of divers degrees. some having less, and some more, even a taste of Gods word and the powers of the World to come, with some real Faith, Love, Joy, Cleansing from former filthiness, and Sanctification by the Blood of the Covenant, which yet are not saving. 2. To others he giveth his Spitit to work in such seasons, manner and measure, (accompanied with congruous providential occurrences and removal of temptations and hindrances) as shall infallibly prevail, 1. For to bring them to Faith; and 2. To further Sanctification and Perseverance. In a word he useth such means with all his Elect as shall infallibly succeed, to bring them to Faith and Perseverance; and so much with all the World, as shall leave them all without excuse. In all this you may see that those benefits which Christ gives as free benefactor and as *Dominus absolutus* are neither for all men alike, nor for all the Elect alike; nor for ought we can know, for any two persons alike in degree; and therefore if Christ may not be said to Die for any man except he give him all that he gives to others without the accusation of being an imperfect Saviour; then he could not be said to Die for most of the Elect. Also you may see in this Scheme how far Christ Died for all men, and how far not; and that the main inequality is not in the Mercies which he gives as Legislator, (till their own Faith or Unbelief make the difference) but in the Mercies which he gives as absolute Lord, which flow from his secret *Decree de rerum Eventu*. And lest

you

you should think that all this Power and Operation ascribed to the Mediator is derogatory to the Father; understand that as the Father and Son are one; so the Mediators Power being but the Supream Derived Power, and not the Supream Primitive Power, it still supposeth the Primitive Power and Operation of the God-head. And therefore both the obtaining and conveying of these benefits to us is still expressed to be as from Christ indeed, but in dependance on, and by derivation from God. And so 1. As they are at first procured by Christs satisfaction, they are said to be by Purchase or Redemption. 2. And as they are continued, or daily given out from the continued Moral Vertue of that satisfaction in Gods acceptation, they are said to he procured by Christs intercessions; which being but the said continued force of his satisfaction and purchase in producing the remote effects; I need not speak of it any further.

Thus I have given you a Scheme of the Nature, Order and Difference of the Effects of Christs Death, in the best manner that at present I can learn from the Word. And though in this you may see my whole sence of the point in hand, and all the distinctions are here couched which I intend to make use of (or at least implyed:) Yet because some of them need a fuller explication, I will next proceed to that.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Some further necessary Distinctions.

1. IN the next place as I told you that it was Essential to Christs Punishment in Specie that he suffered *nostro loco*; so because here lies the first and greatest point of the Controversie in hand, *quorum loco*, in whose stead Christ suffered, and whose sin or guilt did lie upon him. And also because the right or wrong understanding of this point hath so great an influence into most of the consequent points in the Body of Divinity, as either much to help us, or quite to overturn all; I think it exceeding necessary, that we here carefully distinguish of the *Phrase Nostro loco*, or *in our stead*. Understand therefore that a thing may be said to be done or suffered [*In our stead*] in these two sences, 1. When he that doth or suffereth it, doth therein *Legally Personate* us, or *Represent our Persons*, or do it in *our Name*; so far that though *Naturally* the Agent or Patient be *another person*; yet *Legally* Morally or *Civiliter* he is *not another*. Thus a Deputy, Delegate, or Vicarius whom I send in my Name to pay a Debt, is herein *Legally my self*: What he payeth I pay *Civiliter* or in Law sence. I shall shew you when I come to my Propositions how intollerable and desperate an Error it is, overthrowing the very frame of Christianity, to affirm that Christ did thus Die or Satisfie *Nostro loco* in our stead, or any Mans stead.

2. Or one is said to Do or Suffer *Loco alterius* in anothers stead, when it is done to save another from

from doing it that was obliged to do it; or that suffered that which another was obliged to suffer toward the freeing him from it, being *materially* the same, but not formally from the same Obligation, but from the Obligation of a voluntary Sponsion; and being not done or suffered in the Name or in Representation of the Person of the other: But in a Third Person, *viz.* in the Person of a Mediator, Redeemer or Friend. I say, when a Mediator or Sponsor consenteth to bear the Punishment deserved by the Offendor, and so far to have his faults imputed to him; this is to suffer in his stead. And thus I shall anon prove that Christ suffered in the stead of all Mankind, having that Punishment on him which all mens sins deserved.

2. We must also distinguish between Christs Dying *Loco nostro* in the foresaid sence, and his Dying *In nostrum Beneficium;* Or between his Dying for us *Subrogative* and *Effective:* The former being the presupposed ground of the latter. Christ is considerable first as Dying for our *Sins as the pro-causa Meritoria*, before he is considerable as Dying for *our Benefit*, In regard of the order of Execution, as the Efficient Cause is before the end obtained. I shall after shew that he Dyeth *Loco omnium æqualiter*; all mens Sins, except the after excepted, being equally the Cause of his Sufferings; but not *In omnium Bonum æqualiter*, not to procure equal Benefits for all, or for ought we can prove, for any two.

3. We must distinguish between the Sins whose Guilt Christ took upon him and bore on

the Cross; and those which he never took upon him or bore: That is, the final non-performance of the Conditions of the New Covenant.

4. And so we must distinguish between, 1. That Law whose Curse Christ took upon him, and bore, that he might deliver men from it who were obnoxious to it, and obliged to bear it; that is, the first Law of Works. And 2. That Law whose Curse he never took upon him nor bore, nor ever freeth any man from who is once properly, Actually and Peremptorily obliged to bear it, or whom it doth actually condemn as guilty of the threatned Penalty: That is, the Law of Grace, which is his own New Law, condemning the finally Impenitent.

5. We must also distinguish betwixt the *fulfilling of the Law*, which is when it attaineth its most immediate or nearest Ends: And the *satisfaction to the Law-maker for not fulfilling it*. It is fulfilled either, 1. In respect of the *Precept*, and that is only by *Perfect Obedience*. 2. Or in respect of the *Threatning*; which is fulfilled only *per supplicium delinquentis*, and not in anothers suffering. For if it never threatned another: then the threatning is not fulfilled in anothers suffering. You must distinguish also between *satisfaction to the Law*, and *Satisfaction to the Lawgiver*. The *fulfilling of the threatning* may be called *satisfaction to the Law*, for the *not fulfilling of the Precept*. I shall shew you that Christ did not this, but that he *satisfied only the Lawgiver*, and not properly the *Law*; seeing the Law cannot relax it self, and therefore cannot accept of *satisfaction* in stead of *fulfilling*: Yet improperly

perly it may be said to be *satisfied*, in that its pricipal ends are obtained, though not its neareſt. But we muſt not uſe improper ſpeeches without neceſſity,

6. We muſt diſtinguiſh between the ſatisfying of God as *Rector per leges* and the ſatisfying him as *Dominus abſolutus*. Chriſt did not ſatisfie God properly as *Dominus abſolutus*, but as *Rector per Legem*, yea as *Rector per hanc Legem operum*; and ſo ſatisfied him by doing and ſuffering that by which the chief ends of that Law may be attained. Much leſs did God require ſatisfaction *ſtrictly* and properly as a *Creditor* for a Debt: Though *Metaphorically* our Sins and our Puniſhment are called *Debt*; and ſo we are called Debtors and God the Creditor; And ſo ſatisfaction is the *Redditio equivalentis vel Tantidem, non Ejusdem.* Yet without a metaphor, puniſhment may be called *Debitum*, *Due*: But it is Due *to us from God*, and not properly *to God from us*; much leſs due to God as a Debt to a Creditor, or Goods and Poſſeſſions to a Proprietary.

7. We muſt diſtinguiſh betwixt ſuffering *ex obligatione Legis & merito peccati*, as we ſhould have done if we had ſuffered our ſelves; and ſuffering *ex obligatione ſolius ſponſionis propriæ*; as Chriſt did without any Merit or Legal obligation; His own Sponſion being inſtead of both, and our Sin and Obligation being but the *Occaſion*, or *Loco Cauſæ meritoriæ & Obligatoriæ*. Theſe Diſtinctions are chiefly to ſhew *what Chriſt did*, which muſt be known before we can clearly diſcern *for whom*: The uſe will be after manifeſt. More

Diſtinctions

Distinctions are necessary, especially about his Obedience or Fulfilling the Preceptive part of the Law, (and not the commination) and that in his own person, as obligatory to himself, (for the Precept obliged him, though the threatning did not) and not in *Personâ nostrâ* or as obliging us: But I will proceed to those Distinctions which concern the Effects.

8. We must further distinguish between Christs Death as *satisfactory to Justice*, and as a *Price meritorious* to purchase further Benefits: For I shall manifest that the former is the immediate next Effect; and that it could not be *Purchasing, meritorious*, no nor *accepted*, but as it is first *satisfactory*; and that Christ did not Merit or *Purchase* further Benefits *Loco nostro*, so far as he did suffer *Loco nostro*.

9. We must distinguish between Gods acceptance of Christs satisfaction and *Acquittance and Justification of him* thereupon, as having discharged *all* that he undertook; and Gods Acquittance, Justification and Acceptance of *Sinners* themselves. God proclaimeth himself well pleased in his Son, as having done all his work perfectly; when yet he is not well pleased with and in men themselves till Christ be formed in them: nor perfectly, till Christ be perfectly formed in them, and till he have presented them perfectly sanctified, and justified to his Father without spot or blemish, and fit for him to take full delight in.

10. We must distinguish between that Redemption of Mankind, which Christ procured imediately

immediately by his satisfaction; [*viz. That all should be saved from that legal necessity of perishing, and God should Remit his Right of Punishing, and the advantage which his Justice had against man, into the Power and dispose of the Redeemer*; and that Mankind should be all delivered up to Christ as their Lord and Ruler, to be dealt with hereafter upon terms of Mercy and not upon the old terms of the Law of Works in meer rigor of Justice] And that full recovery which Christ afterward maketh by the giving out of his Grace and Benefits. And so (as part of this) we must distinguish beween Mercy and Life *Given to Christ for him*, and Mercy and Life *Given by Christ to Men themselves* directly. For as *Christ* and not *we* did *make the satisfaction* to God, so the Actual benefits are given *first to Christ*, and not directly *to us*; and so *by Christ to us*: Not that Pardon or Justification *formally* is given to Christ; but *Power to pardon and justifie*; to be exercised on the terms which we shall afterwards express: God having not directly and fully forgiven the Sinners themselves but remitted his Right of Punishing as he is Rector according to the old Rigorous condemning Law; delivering the Obligation into the hands of the Redeemer (as we do the Debtors Obligations into the of hands of the surety for his security;) to be put in suit only in Case of rejecting of his conditions of Grace.

11. We must as is said before distinguish between Christ (and the Father in him) *as Rector per Leges or Legislator*, and as *Dominus Absolutus*. And so we must distinguish between those Benefits which Christ as *Rector giveth by his Laws*; and those

those which as meer Benefactor and *Absolute Proprietary* he giveth, though not *contrary* to his Laws or Covenant; yet *over and above* what by Covenant or Law he giveth. Also we must distinguish between the *Event* and Nature of things as such; and the Right to, and Dueness of of things as such. And consequently we must most carefully distinguish between *Gods Will de Rerum Eventu*, and his *Will de Debito*, as such. The clear distinguishing of these two is a singular Key to the opening of the sence of Scripture, and in particular of this Controversie. For indeed, it is to distinguish between our Physicks and our Ethicks. Gods will about Natural Beings as such stands at the top of Physicks, as the first Cause. Gods *will de Debito* as such, stands at the top of our Ethicks, as the first Cause. And you may easily conceive, how the confounding of our Physicks and Ethicks must needs blind us and lose us in our Divinity, as it would do in Philosophy. I joyn all these Distinctions together, for in some they all come to one, or are of necessary consideration joyntly that any one of them may be understood. Our Divines usually with the Schoolmen distinguish between *voluntatem signi* and *Beneplaciti*. But in the ordinary School Sense, that is not the same distinction with that which I here intend. Dr. *Twisse* oft useth the distinction between *voluntatem propositi & precepti*, and meaneth in effect the same that I do: But he oft speaks of it as being but *Metonymically Gods will*, and not properly; by which I must conclude that he meant *quoad Eventum*, and not *quoad Debitum*; for God properly willeth that this shall be Mans Due or Duty.

I shall

I shall therefore a little further explain this Distinction, and then shew you the soundness of it, and then the exceeding usefulness and necessity of it; both in this and many other Controversies. 1. For the Title, I choose rather to denominate it from the Object than the Act; because the Diversity is in the Object, but none in the Species of the Act naturally considered: *Debitum* and *Natural Being* are two distinct things; but [*To Will*] one, and [*to Will*] the other, is all one as to the Nature of Willing. God doth *as properly Will Duty*, as he wills Natural Beings: Yet if I must denominate it from the Acts, I would distinguish between Gods *Directive Will*, and his *Legislative*. For to call it *voluntas Præcepti* is too narrow a term; for the *Precept* is but one part of *Gods Law*, and determineth only of one sort of *Right*; that is, of the dueness of obediential Actions, or forbearance of forbidden Actions. But there is also a *Debitum præmii, & Beneficii purè vel absolute dati, & Debitum Pœnæ*, which the rest of the Law, Testament or Covenant of God determineth of; which must all be here included as well as the former. In sum, the Law determineth, 1. What *Shall be due from us*; 2. And what *Shall be due to us*, and on *what terms*. I call it therefore, *The Will of God de Eventu, & de Debito*, as such. I say. [as such] for else they are coincident: For Gods *Will de rerum Naturâ, vel existentiâ* determineth *de Debito quatenus evenit esse Debitum*, but not *qua Debitum*. And his Will *de Debito* determineth of the *Dueness* of some Events, not as eventual but as due: Or to avoid all ambiguity call it Gods will *de ente mere naturali*; and his will *de debito Morali*; or *Legislative* or Governing

ning. 2. And for the Nature of the distinction, understand further, that there are two Acts which I call *Gods will de Debito*. The first is that immanent Act of his Will by which he strictly and properly willeth what shall be due. This also is twofold; 1. Productive or Instituting dueness: 2. And approbative or taking complacency in Duty. The former of these I principally intend, but exclude not the latter. God doth eternally will every Due. but it is not therefore eternally or from Eternity Due: For he willeth from Eternity (to speak vulgarly) only that this shall be due at such a time, and by such a means. I say by such means: For though Gods will produce all dueness, yet only *by means* doth he produce it. That means is, the *Revelation of his will*. 2. This *Revelation of Gods will de Debito*, we call *his Law*. This therefore is the second thing which I call *Gods will de debito*, or his *Legislative* will; that is, *the Law* as it is *signum voluntatis Divinæ*, that is, *formally as a Law*. This I call *Gods will de Debito*, only *Metonymically*, as it is the sign of his will before expressed. If the proper will of God were separated from this, it would then be no producer of *Dueness or Right* at all; for it would be *no Law* no *signum*; it would lose its Nature as Abrogated Laws do.

Also observe, that you must here carefully distinguish between *Gods Act in making a Law*, and the *Moral Act* of that *Law*, or of his will by that Law when it is made. I call not *Legislation* it self [*Gods will de Debito*] or, [his *Legislative* will.] His ordaining the sign it self, or making the Law which is his instrument, is an Act of his will *de rerum Eventu vel Natura*. For it only maketh that

that instrument or sign by which Right shall be after produced; but doth not directly thereby produce that Right. But it is the signification and *Moral Act* of that Law, which floweth from its Nature which doth produce Right, and which we here intend. The Scribe that writes a Statute, and the Sovereign himself, in compoling the Matter, Order and Terms, doth but make that *Signum or Instrument*, which being made doth therefore Institute Right, because it signifieth the Sovereigns will to institute it. So much for the explication of my meaning in this Distinction.

2. Next I shall say somewhat to prove the soundness of it, which is therefore necessary, because some ignorant persons laugh at it; as if we feigned two wills in God, and one of them contrary to the other. Otherwise, to men of understanding it is not very needful: And therefore I shall say but this briefly: It is not two Wills in God, as two distinct Essences or Faculties that I assert; but only two distinct Acts: Distinct, I say, in regard of their distinct products or Effects, and so to mans apprehension, though in God, we say there, is no diversity or distinction. Yet as we cannot handsomely conceive of his will to save *Peter*, and his will to damn *Judas*, as one act, having such different Effects; so it is here. Who knows not that Naturality and Morality, Physicks and Ethicks, *Event and Right* are different things, and consequently we may and must distinguish of Gods willing them accordingly. When a Man saith, [*You shall do this,*] preceptively, he doth only say [*It shall be your duty to do it*] but saith not that *eventually* you shall do it. Nor are his words false if you never do it. He that saith

For

prophetically or by *prognostication* [*you shall do this*] means that it shall *so come to pass*; and if it do not his words are false: But he doth not say, [*It is or shall be your Duty.*]

12. Accordingly we must distinguish between the antecedent and consequent Acts and Will of Christ as Ruler of Mankind. For the understanding of which and avoiding mistakes, observe, 1. That we speak not now of Eternal Decrees, but of the will of Christ in this Relation as he is the Ruler of the World and Church, and as he is the conveyer of his mercies according to and by his Covenant. and as he judgeth the World according thereunto. 2. That by his Antecedent will, and acts, we mean only that which in his Government is Antecedent to Mans Obedience or Disobedience; which is principally Legislation, and and making his new Covenant; and also the giving of Preachers, and other acts, which are the first part of his Administration. And by his consequent Acts and Will, we mean only that second part of Government, which findeth Man Obedient or Disobedient, and is commonly called *Judgment* and *Execution*. And when we say that by his Antecedent Acts and Will Christ giveth Pardon, Justification and Right to Glory, equally to all; we mean that as Legislator and Promiser, he hath antecedently made an Universal Act of Oblivion or Deed of Gift Conditionally Pardoning, *&c.* all, and no farther than Conditionally Pardoning any. And when we say that he consequently justifieth and saveth none but true Christians, and in that Sence dyed for no other according to his consequent will, we mean that as Judge of Mankind he will give Justification and

and Salvation to Believers and to no others; nor ever intended to do otherwise.

(Let the Reader know, that the foresaid Scheme of the Effects of Christs Death, is more accurately, and yet more briefly done in my *Methodus Theologiæ*: And therefore let him that dislikeeth the *Number* or *Order* of Distributions pass it by: But I have not time to reform it here.

CHAP. III.

Explicatory Conclusions.

Proposition I. CHRIST Died *nullius loco*, so as strictly, and properly, and fully to represent Mens Persons as if *in sensu Legali vel Civili* they themselves did suffer and satisfie.

Prop. II. Christ Died *loco nostro*, so as to bear that Suffering partly for *kind*, and wholly for *weight*, which our sins deserved, and we should have born.

Prop. III. Christ's Dying [*in our stead*] is in order of Nature, before his procuring us Benefits by his Death; as the means necessary thereto.

Prop. IV. Christ dyed not for any Mans final non-performance of the conditions of the Law of Grace.

Prop. V. Christ did not bear for any the proper punishment threatned by the New Law, as such; nor taketh off its Actual proper obligation from any.

Prop. VI. Christs Obedience was a perfect fulfilling of the preceptive part of that Law, whose actual obligation he submitted himself to.

Prop. VII. Christs sufferings were not a *fulfilling* of the Laws commination as obliging us, nor was it *fulfilled* but relaxed to us by a pardon.

Prop. VIII. Christs sufferings were a *satisfaction*, or *Redditio æquivalentis, non ejusdem*) for *our not fulfilling the Precept*, and the *Fathers not fulfilling* the *Threatning* upon us, (or our not bearing the penalty.)

Prop. IX. Christs satisfaction was not made to the Law properly, but to the Law-giver for the transgression of the Law.

Prop. X. The Law as binding us, was the great *Occasion* of Christs Death, and *Loco-causa Obligatoria:* But not the Obligatory Cause it self.

Prop. XI. Christs own Sponsion and his Fathers will were the only proper obligations.

Prop. XII. Christ satisfied God most properly as legislator or Rector *per legem operum*, and not without respect to his Law: His satisfaction was

was for the obtaining the principal ends of the Law.

Prop. XIII. Christ suffered *in our stead*, that we might not suffer; but he did not in proper sence obey *in our stead* that we might not obey, but *for our sakes* and *benefit* and that we might obey.

Prop. XIV. All mens sins equally were the occasion or *Loco causæ meritoriæ* of Christs sufferings (except the fore excepted sins.)

Prop. XV. Christ in suffering bore the punishment antecedently due to all Mankind, equally, and not the punishment due only to some; and so dyed *Loco omnium æqualiter* in regard of his suffering, and their sin the cause.

Prop. XVI. The purchasing meritorious Virtue of Christs Death, and all the rest of the effects which follow thereupon, do presuppose the satisfactory Virtue, as the very ground of all; and without which Christs Death would have been unacceptable to God, as having only *Rationem mali*, or at least would have been but a pattern of Patience as suffered from men.

Prop. XVII. Christ did not purchase further benefits *Loco nostro*, though he suffered Punishment *Loco nostro*.

Prop. XVIII. God was not well pleased with Man, no, not the Elect, nor did he acquit or justifie them, when he proclaimeth himself well-pleased

sed in and with his Son, as being a perfect accomplisher of his will, and when he did acquit and justifie him.

Prop. XIX. All Mankind *immediately* upon Christs *satisfaction*, are redeemed and Delivered from that Legal necessity of Perishing which, they were under, (not by remitting Sin or Punishment directly to them, but by giving up Gods *Jus puniendi* into the hands of the Redeemer; nor by giving any Right directly to them, but *per meram resultantiam* this happy change is made for them in their Relation; upon the said remitting of Gods Right and Advantage of Justice against them,) and they are given up to the Redeemer as their owner and ruler, to be dealt with upon terms of mercy which have a tendency to their recovery.

Prop. XX. In Law-sence, or in respect to the Legislative will of God, Christ Dyed for all men. This will be explained in the following Propositions.

Prop. XXI. Neither the Law whose curse Christ bore, nor God as the Legislator to be satisfied, did distinguish between men as Elect and Reprobate, or as Believers and Unbelievers *de presenti vel de futuro*; and so impose on Christ, or require from him satisfaction for the Sins of one sort more than of another; but for *Mankind* in general.

Prop. XXII. Christ hath made *satisfaction* to God as Legislator; and accordingly his Legal Rigo-

rous

rous Justice is satisfied, for the Sins of all mankind, as they are condemned, and were to be judged directly, primarily, simply by that Law; and hath not satisfied the Legislators Justice for some men only as Elect, or for one more than another, but equally for all.

Prop. XXIII. Christ hath by his Redemption of all obtained a *Novum jus Imperii* over all, and is *Rector derivativè Supremus.*

Prop. XXIV. As those those that know not God nor his Creation, are yet Gods Subjects as Creator, and he their Lord: so those that know not Christ nor his Redemption, are yet his Redeemed, and his Subjects as Redeemed, and he their Lord-Reedeemer as to his Right and Law, and their Obligation.

Prop. XXV. God the Father, and Christ the Mediator now dealeth with no man upon the meer rigorous terms of the first Law: [*Obey perfectly and Live, else thou shalt Die*;] But giveth to all much Mercy, which according to the tenor of that violated Law they could not receive, and calleth them to repentance in order to their receiving farther mercy offered them. And accordingly he will not judge any at last according to the meer Law of works, but as they have obeyed or not obeyed his conditions or terms of Grace.

Prop. XXVI. Though God hath been pleased less clearly to acquaint us, on what terms he dealeth with those that hear not of Christ, yet it

being most clear and certain that he dealeth with them on terms of Grace, and not on the terms of the rigorous Law of works; this general may evince them to be the Mediators Subjects and Redeemed.

Prop. XXVII. The Law of Nature since the fall, is part of the Mediators Law, by which in part he governeth: For it, with all things is deliver-to him.

Prop. XXVIII. Man without Scripture may find that he is a Sinner, and that Sin deserveth Gods wrath, and his destruction; and in the Creatures and Providences, providing for him, preserving, maintaining, delivering him, he may find abundance of Mercy; which being given to one that deserveth misery, must needs evince that it comes from a most gracious disposer, and tends to recovery, and to further mercy.

Prop. XXIX. Hence all Nations of the World have known themselves Sinners, and all Nations have had a Hope of obtaining mercy in the pardon of their sins; and thence it is that all (who acknowledge a God) have had some kind of Religion; and expressed it in Sacrifices or Prayers for pardon and mercy; which could never have been, without the said Hope.

Prop. XXX. Though it be very difficult and not very necessary to know what is the condition prescribed to them that hear not of Christ, or on what terms Christ will judge them; yet to me

me it seems to be the Covenant made with *Adam*, *Gen.* 3. 15. which they are under; requiring, their taking God to be their only God and Redeemer, and so expecting mercy from him, and loving him above all, as their end and chief good; and repenting of Sin and Sincere Obedience according to the Laws promulgate to them, to lead them further.

Prop. XXXI. As the rigorous Law of works is so far taken down to all men, that they are no longer under its imposed necessity of perfect obedience to salvation; so the *Mosaical* Ceremonial Law, is Abrogated totally, and so the Obligation destroyed for all that were under it, without difference of Elect or Non-Elect.

Prop. XXXII. God the Father and Christ the Mediator hath freely without any prerequisite condition on mans part enacted a Law of Grace, of Universal extent in regard of its tenor, by which he giveth, as by a Deed of Gift, Christ himself with all his following benefits which he bestoweth (as Benefactor and Legislator) and this to all alike, without excluding any; upon condition they Believe and Accept the Offer.

Prop. XXXIII. By this Law, Testament or Covenant, *All men are Conditionally* Pardoned, Justified and Reconciled to God already, and no man Absolutely; nor doth it make a difference, nor take notice of any, till mens per-

formance or non-peformance of the condition make a difference.

Prop. XXXIV. This Law or Covenant Christ ordaineth Heraulds to Publish, and commandeth them to Preach it to every Creature, and commandeth every man in his place to publish it; without excepting or excluding any from the Priviledge of receiving it.

Prop. XXXV. As a Sovereign is not bound to cause every particular man infallibly to hear of his Laws, so he maketh a convenient publick Declaration of them; so Christ as Legislator is not bound to provide that every man hear of his Law whom it doth concern: Men that by Nature may be convinced that there is a God, and how necessary it is to know him and their Duty concerning him, and how little they do know of him are bound to make all possible enquiry after the further Revelation of his will, though it were by travelling into other Countries.

Prop. XXXVI. When we say God and the Mediator give pardon and Salvation to all men conditionally; we do not mean that there is any condition of his *Making the Grant*, but of his *performing it*, or of *our receiving the thing promised*. He absolutely maketh a conditional Deed of Gift. He makes the *Deed*, and we are conditionally pardoned whether we believe or not. But we shall not be actually pardoned till we belive.

Prop. XXXVII.

Prop. XXXVII. The condition of this Law Grant is nothing unreasonable nor of Natural proper impossibility, (it is an Easie Yoake, and Commands that are not grievous) it being not the least *repensum*, price or requital; but only [the Hearty Acceptance of the offered Benefit according to its Nature and use:] It is therefore proper enough to say (as Scripture doth) that *all men are reconciled*, the *Worlds sins taken away*, and they forgiven; though yet none of this is *Actually* done, nor ever shall be to the final Rejecters; because in a moral sence, that is said to be done: which being highly beneficial and necessary, may be done if we will, all the other impediments being removed; and nothing but the refusal can deprive Men of the benefit, the Law supposing that he that is *compos mentis* will accept so great an offered benefit. Christ having done all his part or *quantum in se*, as *Satisfier* and *Legislator* and given himself with his benefits to every man that will accept him; so that nothing but their own wilful refusal can deprive them of them; in Law sence he may well be said, not only to Die for them, but to have procured them Pardon, Justification and Life. Whereas if the condition had either been a thing of proper Natural Impossibility, or unreasonable, or unhonest, or if it were long of Christ that it is not performed, than it were improper to say that Christ and Life is given them, or that Christ Dyed for them to procure this gift.

Prop. XXXVIII. Christ hath given Faith to none by his Law or Testament; though he hath revealed

vealed that to some he will as Benefactor and *Dominus Absolutus* give that Grace which shall infallibly produce it. And God hath given some to Christ that he might prevail with them accordingly: Yet this is no giving it *to the Person*, nor hath he in himself ever the more Title to it; nor can any lay claim to it as their due.

Prop. XXXIX. It belongeth not to Christ as *satisfier*, nor yet as *Legislator* to make wicked refusers to become willing and receive him and the benefits which he offers; therefore he may do all for them that is fore-expressed though he cure not their unbelief.

Prop. XL. Faith is a fruit of the Death of Christ, (and so is all the good which we do enjoy): But not *directly* as it is *satisfaction* to *justice*; but only *Remotely*, as it proceedeth from that *jus Dominii* which Christ hath received, to send the Spirit in what measure and to whom he will, and to succeed it accordingly; and as it is necessary to the attainment of the further ends of his Death, in the certain gathering and saving of the Elect. So that most directly it floweth from the good pleasure of God and the Redeemer, which we call Prædestination. So that it is an unmeet Speech (and such as Scripture never useth) to say, that [*Christ dyed to purchase us Faith*] though it be a *Fruit of his Purchase*. As if a Prince should Ransome or Buy a condemned Malefactor, agreeing and resolving that yet he shall not be saved, if he will spit in his Redeemers Face and refuse him and his kindness. And if it be known that this Malefactor

Malefactor is so desperately wicked, that he will thus reject and abuse his Redeemer and refuse his kindness, except the Prince send a bosom Friend to perswade him, who is the most powerful unresistable Orator in the World: If the Prince because he is resolved neither to lose the Man, nor his Price of Ransom, doth send this Orator with a Charge that he shall take no denial, nor cease till he have procured the Malefactors consent; is it a convenient Speech to say, that he gave his Ransom Mony to purchase the Malefactors consent to be delivered? Or to cure his wicked nature? No: Yet it is true that his Price was a ground-work and Preparative to this effect; so is it in our present Case.

Prop. XLI. The Resurrection of the Bodies of all Men is a Benefit procured by the death and Resurrection of Christ: (For though the Soul it self should everlastingly have suffered, yet the Body should have remained in its state of dissolution, if Christ had not restored it) which Resurrection in it self is a mercy to all, (and it is a means to Gods further Glory by his Creature) though the wicked turn it to be the enterance of unspeakable misery to themselves.

Prop. XLII. There is no mercy which any Man enjoyeth by Right of Law from God, but it is from the Covenant or Law of Grace, and so from the Blood of that Covenant: For from the old violated rigorous Law it cannot be; therefore it must be from the Law of Grace.

Prop.

Prop. XLIII. Christ by his Law of Grace, hath made it every Mans duty that hears it, to believe in him, and accept him, as our Saviour that hath made satisfaction for their Sins, and so dyed for them, and is their Redeemer: And to be highly thankful to him for this his Mercy.

Prop. XLIV. Christ by his Law hath made a far sorer punishment than before belonged to them, to be due to all those that believe not in him as one that hath so satisfied, and are not thankfull for it, and do not take him for their Redeemer. And for refusing their Lord-Redeemer, shall they be condemned.

Prop. XLV. The consciences of the damned in Hell (which will be Gods executioners) will everlastingly torment them for refusing that Pardon and Salvation that was so dearly purchased for them, and that Redeemer that expressed so much Love to them, and for not performing so reasonable and easie a condition, as Faith. They shall not then have the discovery of an impossibility in the condition, or that Christ never died for them, and never was their Redeemer, and consequently that it was no Sin of theirs to refuse a Redeemer, that was not their Redeemer, and satisfaction that was none for them, I say, they shall not have such discoveries to ease their consciences, and lessen their torments, and make Hell as no Hell to them.

Prop. XLVI. A Christ-Redeemer, that hath satisfied justice, is the object of Commanded Faith, and presupposed to it: Annd he that commandeth all Men to believe in Christ a one that hath redeemed them or satisfied for their Sins, doth hereby assert the truth of this supposition.

Prop. XLVII. The constitution of Christs Kingdom containeth many great universal mercies, Antecedent to those that are given conditionally by his Covenant or Law of Grace; Such as are the giving of the Covenant it self, and the Institution of Sacraments, Ordinances, Officers, *&c.* Therefore as to be a subject is Antecedent to the being of an *Obedient* or a *Rewarded* Subject; so Christs Antecedent mercies of Redemption, extend to more than his consequent mercies do, which suppose the performance of the conditions of his Covenant.

Prop. XLVIII. The foundations of Christs Kingdom being first laid in his undertaking, Performances, Death, Resurrection, and Legislation or Covenant-making; so there are three distinct states of his subjects: 1. The Antecedent state (Antecedent to any act of their own) is to be *subditi obligati obliged subjects.* 2. The mediate state is to be *consenting obedient subjects*, or *rebellious* and *disobedient.* 3. The consequent state is to be *justified rewarded subjects*, or *Condemned Subjects.* And it will not follow that Christ never brought men into

into the first condition, because he never brought them into the last.

Prop. XLIX. Accordingly the Kingdom of Christ the Mediator, in its largest extent containeth all Mankind as redeemed, and made his obliged Subjects, though most prove Rebells. But in a limited sense it containeth only the faithful, obedient, and justified part of the universal Kingdom.

Prop. L. It is this second consenting Part of his subjects only who are his *Church*, and are by Baptism engaged to him. So that the Kingdom of Christ as Redeemer is larger than his Church; and they are not words of the same signification, unless when the word Kingdom is taken in the narrow sense.

Prop. LI. God hath not divided the World into two Parts, and put one Part only under the Government of Christ, and Governeth the other immediately himself only as meer Creator: But Christ is Administrator General over all Mankind.

Prop. LII. They that say that God giveth, all the mercies which the ungodly have, according to the first Covenant of Innocency; must make that Covenant another thing than indeed it was.

Prop. LIII. They that feign God to continue the Covenant of Innocency, as to the Promissory Part, and to Govern those that are born in sin and

and misery, by that Law which saith [*Be Innocent and Live*] do expose Gods Government falsly to reproach.

Prop. LIV. They that hold that Heathens and Hypocrites are under no Covenant or Law that hath conditional promises, do deny a great Part of Gods Government of Mankind, and give them more excuse for their neglect of all means for their Salvation, than is true, or than God will allow of.

Prop. LV. They that say that all the mercies bestowed on Heathens, or Hypocrites are given them without the purchase of Christ, by the meer will of God not respecting any reconciler or Propitiation, do Sin against the Scripture reasons of Christs Office, and undertaking, and do open a Gap for the reasonings of them who plead against the necessity of Christs death for the Elect.

Prop. LVI. Though Christs Dominion over inanimates and Bruits do not prove that he dyed for them; Yet his dying for Mankind in general, procured his Dominion over them; which is joyned with his Empire over the same Persons, which he exerciseth by such Laws as have a tendency to their repentance, Pardon and Salvation.

Prop. LVII. All this considered, It is (*de nomine*) a proper Speech much used in Scripture, to say that Christ dyed for all Men, and is the Saviour of the World, and is the Lamb of God that

that taketh away the Sins of the World, and is a propitiation for the Sins of the whole World, and tasted Death for every man, and that if one Died for all then were all Dead, &c. Seeing all the foresaid Benefits of his Death, are actually given them.

Some Expository Thesis about the Effects of the Death of Christ.

Proposition I. THE First and most Immediate Use and Effect of Christs Death, was the satisfaction of Gods Justice for mans Violation of his Law.

Prop. II. It was not the Law it self that Christ satisfied (if we speak properly) but the Law-giver. Though improperly the Law it self may be said to be satisfied when its *Ends* are attained; that is, the Ends of the Legislator in giving the Law. The Law knows no proper satisfaction. To admit of satisfaction instead of fulfilling and execution, is beyond the power of the Law, and is the act of the Legislator as he is above the Law.

Prop. III. Christ did not suffer from the *Obligation* of the *Law*, but from the *Obligation* of his *own Sponsion*; on *occasion* of the Laws obliging *us* to suffer. The Law never obliged Christ to Suffer (though it did to obedience.)

Prop. IV.

Prop. IV. Christs sufferings were not a *fulfilling* of the *Laws Threatning* (though he bore its *Curse Materially*;) but a satisfaction for our *not fulfilling* the *Precept*, and to prevent *Gods fulfilling* the *Threatning* on us.

Prop. V. Christ paid not therefore the *Idem* but the *Tantundem* or *æquivalens*, not the *very Debt* which we owed and the Law required, but the *Value*.

(Else it were not *strictly satisfaction*, which is *Redditio æquivalentis*: And (it being improperly called the *Paying of a Debt*, but properly *A suffering for the Guilty*) the *Idem* is nothing but *Supplicium Delinquentis*. In *Criminals*, *Dum alius solvit simul alius solvitur*. The Law knoweth no *Vicarius Pœna*; though the *Lawmaker* may admit it, as he is *above Law*. Else there were no place for *Pardon*, if the *proper Debt* be Paid, and the *Law not Relaxed* but *Fulfilled*.

Prop. VI. The *Meriting* and *Purchasing of further Benefits* is consequential to the *satisfactorines* of Christs Death. It would be so far from *meriting* (as it is his meer hurt) were it not first necessary for *satisfaction*, that it would be *displeasing to God*, who is merciful, and delighteth not in the *Blood* of the *Just*.

Prop. VII. Though Christs Death be *first satisfactory* and next *Meritorious* of *further good*: Yet his *Obedience* is first *Meritorious* and afterward *Satisfactory*: For it could not *Satisfie* but by *Meriting*.

Quod præcipitur & ita est Obedientiæ materia proxima est [*Agere*] *vel* [*Non agere*] *& non,* [*Pati*] *sed* [*Pati*] *potest esse materia remota.*

Prop. VIII. Because *Punishment* is not a *Thing Commanded* by the Law, but *Threatned*; therefore all *Obedience* properly is *active*, (for suspensive is by act of will,) and the distinction between Christs *Active* and *Passive* Obedience, must be carefully understood, or else it will tend to confound *Obedience* and *Punishment*. His *Passive Obedience* is but his *Obeying* in *Submission to suffering*; where the *Consent* or *Submission* is the *direct matter* of *Obedience*, and not the *suffering it self* submitted to.

Prop. IX. Christ did *Give* his *Satisfaction directly* and *strictly*; not *to Man for whom* he suffered, but *to God.* whom he satisfied.

Prop. X. Yet he may be said to *Give* it *to men*, (especially in their Union with him and Justification) in *that he gives them the fruits of it*: As a Father is said to give his Son a thousand pound, that layeth it out in *Lands* for him: Though properly the *Seller* hath the *Money*, and the *Son* the *Lands* only.

Prop. XI. It was not the *Sins* of the *Elect only*, but of all *Mankind fallen*, which lay upon *Christ satisfying*. And to assert the contrary injuriously diminisheth the Honour of his Sufferings; and hath other desperate ill consequences.

Prop.

Prop. XII. Christs *satisfaction* was made to *God as Legislator* and *Rector Supremus*, and not as *Dominus absolutus* or meer *Proprietary*.

Prop. XIII. Christ did neither *Obey* nor *Suffer* in any Mans *stead* by a *strict proper Representation* of his *Person* in point of Law; so as that the *Law* should take it as done or suffered by the *party himself*. But only as a *third person*, as a *Mediator* he voluntarily bore what else the Sinner should have born.

To assert the contrary (specically as to particular persons considered in actual Sin,) is to overthrow all Scripture Theology, and to introduce all Antinomianism, to overthrow all possibility of pardon, and assert Justification before we Sinned or were Born; and to make *our selves* to have Satisfied God.

Therefore we must not say that *Christ stood nostro loco* so as to *personate us*, or *Represent our Persons* in *Law Sence*; but only to bear what else we must have born.

Prop. XIV. Christ by his Death (and so satisfaction to Justice) hath purchased to *himself* a full *Propriety* in all the Creatures which were under the Curse, and so is become *Dominus Absolutus* of all, on a new Title of *Redemption*, as God was before on the Title of Creation.

Prop. XV. Christ hath hereby *purchased* also a *Supream Rectorship* (so far as a *Derived* Power may be called *Supream*; and *God* as he is *Redeemer* is *properly Supream*) grounded on his *Absolute pro-*

priety; even as *Gods Rectorship* as *Creator* was grounded on his *Absolute Propriety* as *Creator*. Every man may rule *his own* according to its *Nature* and *Capacity*.

Prop. XVI. Hereupon by *actual Rendition*, all things are *Delivered* up to Christ both as *Proprietary* and *Rector*.

Prop. XVII. As *Proprietary* or *Dominus*, Christ *over-ruleth* the World, and *disposeth* of all *Events* and *Beings* Naturally (as most conduceth to his Redemption Ends.)

Prop. XVIII. As *Plenipotent Rector* he now *Ruleth* all *inferior Rational* Creatures by his Laws, as the *Universal Lord-Redeemer*.

Prop. XIX. Seeing both the *Rational Creature*, and the visible frame of the Creation are delivered up to Christ the Redeemer, it must needs follow, that the very Law of Nature (whether it be *in Natura rerum, ut signum*; or *in mente humanâ, ut principia Cognita*) is *Christs Law*: And so that those that are ruled by the meer Law of Nature are ruled by Christ, so far as they do well.

Prop. XX. As *God* is the *Ruler* (as to Title and some Legislation and Judgment;) of those *very Pagans* who *know him not, but deny a Godhead*; so Christ is so the *Ruler* of those *very Infidels* who *know him not*, but *deny the Mediator*.

Prop

Prop. XXI. In giving up all *Propriety* and *Rule* to *Christ*, *God* has not diveſted himſelf of any thing, ſave only a *Right* or (as it were,) an *Obligation* to *puniſh* the pardoned. For as *Christ* is *God himſelf*; ſo the *Father* ſtill *Poſſeſſeth* and *Ruleth* by the *Redeemer*. As he hath ſtill the *Title of Creator*, ſo is he in the *Son God-Redeemer*.

Prop. XXII. Seeing no Man *can fulfill* the *Firſt Law*, or *Covenant*, and no Man can be ſaved by a *Covenant not kept*, and Chriſt Redeemed not Man into *abſolute liberty*, (to be *from under Law and Rule*, which were *Miſery* to him and *not liberty*) Therefore it hath pleaſed the Father and Mediator to make to Man a *New Law* and *Covenant* ſuited to his preſent State of Miſery.

Prop. XXIII. The *Tenor* of *this Law* is that *whoſoever will Repent, Thankfully and heartily accept Jeſus Chriſt to be his Saviour, Teacher, King and Head, believing him to be the Redeemer, and will Love him (and God in him) above all, and obey him ſincerely, to the Death, ſhall upon his firſt acceptance be Juſtified and Adopted, and upon his perſeverance be juſtified at Judgment, ſaved from Hell, and Glorified: And whoſoever rejecteth him, ſhall bear the Guilt and puniſhment of all his Sins againſt the Law, and for his refuſal, be far ſorelier puniſhed.*

Prop. XXIV. By this *New Law*, or Covenant, Christ hath brought all Men, where it is *Promulgate*, under the *Duty* of *receiving him*, and *Life in him:* And under a *Promise of Life*, if they do receive him, and a *Threatning* of Death if they reject him.

Prop. XXV. The *tenour* of this *New Law* in all these Parts is *Universal*, extending to *all*, (No Man is excepted out of *Precept*, *Promise*, or *Threatning*) whether the *Promulgation* be *Universal* or *not*.

Prop. XXVI. It can hardly be proved that there is any great Part of the World, that have not heard of Christ, or had some means to have come neerer to the knowledg of him.

Prop. XXVII. All those that *have not heard of Christ*, have yet *much Mercy* which they *receive from him*, and is the Fruit of his *Death:* According to the well or ill using whereof, it seems probable that God will judg them.

Prop. XXVIII. But it is safest to leave the Case of those that never heard of Christ and their Infants, as a thing unrevealed or so darkly revealed that God would not have us know any more of it, than that our condition is far better than theirs, that so we may be thankful.

Prop. XXIX. It is a course to blind and not to inform Men, to lay the main stress in the Doctrine of Redemption, upon our uncertain con-

conclusions of Gods dealing with such as never heard of Christ: Seeing all proof is *per notiora*: And we must reduce points uncertain to the certain, and not the certain to the uncertain, in our Trial.

Prop. XXX. Christ may be *Ruler de jure*, and *in Part de facto*, where yet *Satan prevaileth*, and the Sinner shall perish for *Rebellion*.

Prop. XXXI. In the New Law Christ hath truly *given himself* with a *Conditional Pardon*, *Justification*, and *Conditional Right to Salvation*, to all Men in the *World without Exception*.

Prop. XXXII. This Law giveth Christ to no Man in the World by name (now) nor more then other, antecedently to their believing: But to all if they will believe.

Prop. XXXIII. It is therefore a proper and true Speech to say that Christ *dyed for all* (especially *all that ever heard his Gospel*): Seeing that in *Law sence* he did *Dye for them in all the* forementioned respects. As the nature of the Law is to constitute *Debitum*, *Dueness*; so it constitutes to all *Men*, 1. The *Dueness* of *Obedience*, that they *accept* Christ *offered* them. 2. The *Dueness of the Benefit*, *if they accept him* (a conditional due.) 3. And the *Dueness of the punishment* if they *reject him*. So that in Law Sense Christ dyed for all.

Prop. XXXIV. If Christ were not *their Redeemer*, and his *Satisfaction* had been *no way for them*,

nor a *Mercy* to them, then the *Damned* ſhould not *periſh* for rejecting their Redeemer, nor for refuſing the mercy of Redemption; Nor their conſciences accuſe them for it. But undoubtedly *for this* will be their deſtruction, and *for this* their conſciences will accuſe them.

Prop. XXXV. It being not the ſatisfaction it ſelf that is tendered to Sinners, but the *Fruit* of it, It cannot by any Miniſter, nor will not by Chriſt, be offer'd (in thoſe Fruits) to Men, if it were not firſt *given* and *accepted for them* as well as others (in Law Sence) by God, from the Redeemer. The *Rector* or *Creditor* muſt firſt *receive the ſatisfaction*, before a *diſcharge* can be offered to the offendor or Debtor, on conſideration of that ſatisfaction made and accepted: Much more, before Men can be condemned juſtly for refuſing it. If the ſatisfaction were given and accepted for the Elect only, it could not in the Benefits which wholly preſuppoſe it, be ſo offered to the Non-Elect, and they judged for refuſing the benefit of a ſatisfaction never made for them.

Prop. XXXVI. Chriſts dying for Men, is Antecedent to their believing in him: Their believing preſuppoſeth his dying for them: His Death ſaveth them becauſe they believe; but he did not die for them becauſe they believe, but they muſt believe becauſe he dyed for them. The *Act* both as performed and commanded here preſuppoſeth the Object. The *Command* therefore of *believing* preſuppoſeth that Chriſtdyed for Men.

Prop.

Prop. XXXVII. No Mans name or Deſcription (ſo as to difference him from others) being in the offer and promiſe conditional, but it being made alike to all, it will follow that no Man could have any true ground to believe or accept Chriſt if he knew not that he is one of thoſe, to whom he is univerſally offered, and conditionally given; and conſequently for whom he ſatisfied.

Prop. XXXVIII. If the condition on which Chriſt is given to all (and Life in him) were ſomething of natural proper impoſſibility, or unreaſonable, or if it were long of Chriſt that the condition is not performed by them, then it were leſs proper to ſay, that Chriſt is given them, or that he dyed for them, in reſpect to this conditional gift. But ſeeing the condition is nothing of natural proper impoſſibility, nor unreaſonable, being but their hearty acceptance of Chriſt as he is offered them and not the leaſt *Repenſum*; requital, price, or repayment; and nothing but their own wicked diſpoſition, and obſtinacy can cauſe their non-performance; ſo that they may have Chriſt and Life if they will; therefore it is proper to ſay that Chriſt is given them, and conditional Pardon and Life in him; and that Chriſt therefore dyed for them.

Prop. XXXIX. It is Gods Law or Covenants which conſtitute the Right or Dueneſs of obedience, rewards, and puniſhments, and it is not Election or the meer Decree of God that doth

doth any of these. We have no Right to Christ upon Election, till the Covenant or Law give us Right.

Prop. XL. Elect and Non-Elect therefore have equal Right to Christ, till believing difference them: That is, all have a conditional Right, and none an actual and absolute.

Prop. XLI. The Covenant berween the Father and Mediator (commonly so called) gave Christ a full Power to confer pardon and Life; but gave not to Men any Right or Title to the benefits.

Prop. XLII. Nor did that Covenant or promise which God made to fallen mankind of sending a Saviour to Redeem them, give this Right actually to these benefits.

Prop. XLIII. Nor doth that promise or Covenant which God hath made, of giving a new and soft Heart to the Elect, give any Man an actual Right to Remission, Justification or Glory: No nor to renewing Grace: it being but a prediction what God resolveth to do for the saving of some, known only to himself and so a discovery of his purpose, and not a conferring of Right. Or if it were a *Promissum vel Donatio in diem, sine conditione,* as some would make it, yet it would not give actual Title till the time come: *Non datur actio ante diem in talibus promissis inter homines.* It is the nature of such gifts that upon (the Donors will) the Right should be as it were in passing from the Donour to the receiver till that day *Et si cessit dies, salrem non venit.* It is not

not ours in Title till the Day. But indeed *here* is *no prefixed day*, nor *proper Gift*.

Prop. XLIV. We Must therefore carefully distinguish between these three forementioned Covenants, and that universal Law or conditional Covenant of Grace made to all mankind; which is it by which Christ ruleth, and will judge us: And which is his Instrument of conferring Right, and so of pardoning, Justifying, and Adopting us.

Prop. XLV. Christ hath a threefold Kingdom: Of one all the World are Subjects, these he over-ruleth, and partly ruleth to restraint at least, by the Law of Nature. Of the other (the visible Church) all professed Christians are members: These he ruleth by his Law of Grace, and Spirit, but differently. Of the third (which is the Souls of believers) only true believers are members: These only Christ ruleth to Salvation; but the rest also, as Redeemer.

Prop. XLVI. When the Schoolmen and our own Divines say, that Christ dyed *for* all *quoad sufficientiam pretii*, but not *quoad efficientiam*; they cannot without absurdity be interpreted to mean, that his *Death* is *sufficient for all if it had been a Price for them*; and not a *sufficient Price for them*; for that were to contradict themselves. And so Christ could not be said to *dye for Men quoad sufficientiam pretii*. For it is neither *for them*, nor *a Price*, so considered.

Prop.

Prop. XLVII. It seems an injurious feigning of Christ to suffer much in vain, to say that he paid a Price sufficient for all the World, when yet it shall be no way efficient: Unless they think that Christs sufferings are no greater for all Men, than if he had suffered but for one or few; and that *minima guttula sanguinis Christi sufficit ad redimendum mille mundos*, which our Divines disclaim, as a dangerous Error. They therefore that think it, a making Christ to suffer in vain, to say, *He dyed for some that perish*; do themselves make him much more, to suffer in vain, in saying, he paid a Price for some, which was sufficient for all, but shall be no way efficient for them.

Prop. XLVIII. Christs Death is a *sufficient Price and satisfaction to God* for the Sins of all Mankind: The *Efficiency of satisfaction passive* is it wherein the *sufficiency* to *further uses*, doth consist. But it *effecteth actual Remission, Justification Adoption, Salvation*, only for *Believers*. This is the plain truth, and the Sense of Divines in saying, that Christ *dyed for all quoad sufficientiam pretii, non quoad Efficientiam.*

Prop. XLIX. It hath not so much as a shew of Injustice or wrong to any for God to punish unbelievers for the same Sins that Christ died for, if we do but understand, 1. The difference between suffering by our selves or our delegate, substitute or Vicar, and a Mediator suffering for us, 2. And between *solutio ejusdem, & satisfactio* which is *Redditio equivalentis*, and so 3. Between a *refusable suffering* or payment, (as the last is) which doth acquit but on what terms

terms the accepter pleaseth, and not *ipso facto*; and a *not refusable payment*, (such as the first is) God accepted the satisfaction on those terms only, that no final Rebel should partake of the saving benefit. If it be a wrong, it is either against Christ, or the Sinner, Not to the *Sinner*, for he suffereth but once: And the former suffering of Christ, was not in personation or representation of his person, nor as his substitute, nor appointed or procured by him: But by a third Person, in the Person of a Mediator sent by God, and voluntarily undertaking it. Nor to Christ is it any wrong: For 1. He is willing: *Volenti non fit injuria.* 2. It was the agreement, it should be so: 3. Yea it is he that *doth it*. He as Judge condemns them for ingratitude and Rebelling against himself and consequently leaves all the rest of their Sins upon them.

Prop. L. Nor is it any more absurd that Christ should satisfie for those that were in Hell, when he sufferd, then that he should do it for those that were in Heaven at his suffering. He paid the Price which he had agreed to pay, which became effectual upon the agreement and undertaking (before the payment:) And was then offered to Mankind: Of whom some suffered for rejecting it as others were saved upon the accepting it, even before his death.

Prop. LI. Nor was Christs Satisfaction for those that perish *Vain*: Seeing it is the ground of his New Title of Lord-redeemer, as to Dominion and Rectorship, and so the ground of his New Legislation, Judgment, Administration

tion and Government of the World; and will be the occasion of his just destruction of the Rejectors of him, even those Rebels that would not have him to Reign over them, and of his glory therein. Even as Gods Creation and preservation of Men, is not to be called Vain, or no mercy, because he gives not all Men Hearts to repent, and so some perish. For as Creation laid the ground of the Creators Dominion, Rectorship, Legislation and Rule, and Judgment (if the first Covenant had stood in force as it was at first): So did Redemption by satisfaction do in respect of the Redeemer, and Covenant of Grace:

Prop. LII. All that Christ (by the *work of Redemption*) did *purchase a propriety* in and *Dominion over*, were not *Redeemed by him*: *Brutes* and *Devils* are hereby under his *Dominion*, and Devils shall be judged by him: But not as *Subjects*. For he procured (as Mediator a *Dominion over these*, but as *utensils* in his House, or as *Enemies* to be restrained, ordered, and destroyed: Therefore Christs *judging Devils* will not prove that he *redeemed* them: When yet his *judging unbelieving Men* will prove that he *Redeemed* them. *Devils* are judged as *Enemies*, but not as *Rebels* against *their Lord-Redeemer*: But *wicked* Men are condemned as *Rebels* against him, for ungrateful rejecting a benefit given them. If a Country fall into Rebellion, and the King sentenceth all to Fire and Sword, and the Prince by satisfaction purchase all to himself both Men and Country: And send Heralds to proclaim mercy and pardon to all that will

will accept him, and thankfully acckowledg his favour: Some accept and some reject him. The same Prince destroyeth these Rebels for rebelling: And he destroyeth also all the Bears, Lyons, Wolves, and devouring Beasts that annoyed and kill'd his subjects. Now will any say, that because he appointeth the Wild Beasts to death, and yet satisfied not for them, nor Redeemed them, that therefore he redeemed not the Rebels neither? All sayings and writings have different Sences in the same words sometimes, according to the difference of the *Materia Subjecta*.

Prop. LIII. The Doctrine of *Universal Redemption* thus delivered, runs with the whole Scope of Scripture, and hath not the least inconveniences; when the denial of it, contradicteth a multitude of expres Texts, and bringeth on more desperate consequences than can easily be conceived.

Prop. LIV. Though Christ *dyed equally for all Men*, in the foresaid *Law-Sence*, as he satisfied the offended *Legislator*, and as giving himself *to all alike* in the *conditional Covenant*; Yet he never properly intended or purposed the actual justifying and saving of all; nor of any but those that come to be justified and saved. He did not therefore dye for all, nor for any, that perish, with a Decree or Resolution to save them much less did he dye for all alike, as to this intent.

Prop.

Prop. LV. All that conditional Pardon with the means of Grace, and common Mercies which the Non-elect do actually receive in time, were purposed for them before time, and intended to them as Fruits of Christs Death; and so far even in regard of his Purpose *de eventu applicationis*, Christ may be said to Die for them, (besides the foresaid satisfaction:) For God being *Rector per Leges* deals with men on *Law terms*, and gives Mercies, and Executes Justice only according to his Laws. He would not so much as relax the Old Law for the pardon of any Sin, but by a new Law, which is *Lex Remedians*. But the old Law being broken, God can shew no mercy now according to its tenour: It must be therefore according to the Law of Grace and from it, that all men receive their Mercies; and consequently from the Blood of that Covenant, which is the ground thereof, and by which Apostates are said to have been sanctified, *Heb.* 10.

Prop. LVI. When we say that Christ did Die for men conditionally, as to his *Death it self*, and the *satisfaction* to Justice *immediately* thence flowing; we cannot intend it, or truly say so: Nor yet as to the *granting* of his *Universal Conditional pardon*: For Christ *absolutely procured* all these. But we mean it only in regard of *Actual Remission, Justification and Salvation*. The *Covenant* or *Promise* is indeed *Conditional*; that is, there are conditions required on our part to the fulfilling of it, that we may have right to the Benefit: But no conditions for the *granting* of it; much

much less for *Christs Actual Dying* and *Satisfying.*

Prop. LVII. Though it be disputable whether God have any *Decretive will de eventu*, properly *Conditional*, yet is it beyond all doubt that he hath a *Conditional will de Debito*, and *Conditional Laws*; and it being to *God as Legislator* that Christ made *Satisfaction*, and it being by Law that the Dueness of Justification and Salvation is conveyed to believers, and the Dueness of Punishment to Unbelievers, therefore it is very proper to say, that *Christ by his Death hath purchased Salvation for all Men Conditionally.*

Prop. LVIII. Yea, it is undoubted that the very *Decretive Will of God de Eventu applicationis* is *Conditional* in this sence; that Faith and Repentance are Decreed by God to be Conditions of Justification and Salvation, but not conditions of Gods act of Decreeing (*Twisse* saith that in this Sense no man denyeth Gods will to be conditional, *Vid. Consid. of Syn. Dort. and Arles*, &c. Page 61. And against *Cotton* Page 74.)

Prop. LIX. Those that dare say, that Christ is an imperfect Redeemer if he do not procure Faith it self for every Man that he Dyeth for, (which is their Master Argument) may as well say, that God is an imperfect Creator, because he maketh not Worms to be Men; or that he is an imperfect Conservator because he preserved not man from Mortality, Damnation and Antecedent Calamities; especially from

Sin: Or that he is imperfectly Merciful, because he permitteth Men to sin; and Condemneth them: Or that Christ is an Imperfect Redeemer of the Elect, because he suffereth them after his Redemption to Sin, Suffer and Die: Or, that the Holy Ghost is an imperfect Sanctifier and Caller, because many wicked Men are Sanctifyed and Believe imperfectly (so as will not suffice to Salvation) and because they resist and quench the Spirit, and fall from that Faith and Sanctification which they had. Or that the Spirit is an imperfect Comforter; because so many Saints Live and Die in such unconformitable sadness: Or that Scripture is an imperfect means, because the Effect is so imperfect. In a word, they may as well say, that where God doth not overcome mens wicked dispositions, he is an imperfect God to them in regard of his Mercies: All which beseem not the Tongue of a Christian.

Prop. LX. That Argument commonly brought against Universal Redemption, [that where Christ doth the work of a Mediator for any man in one of his Offices, he doth it in all] is undeniably destructive to the cause it is brought for: For it is undeniable that Christ as Prophet, and King, Teacheth, Calleth, Illuminateth, many Non-elect; giveth some Faith, some Taste of his word and the powers of the World to come; sanctifyeth them by the Blood of the Covenant, and washeth them from their former pollutions. *Mat.* 13. *Heb.* 6. and 10. 2 *Pet.* 2. 20. Therefore in his Priestly Office

Office he must (at least) be as far their Mediator.

CHAP. IV.

The First Proposition Asserted.

Prop. I. *CHRIST in Suffering did not Strictly and properly bear and represent the person of the Sinner, so as Civiliter, Moraliter, Legaliter, it might be said that* [*we either satisfied or suffered in or by Christ.*]

Explic. I am not willing to make the meer words here, any matter of quarrel. If any dislike my term of mine, or like his own; let him apply himself to the matter in Question, and let the words pass. 1. I deny not that Christ Suffered *nostro loco*, in our place or stead; suffering that which we deserved, and should else have unavoidably suffered. 2. I acknowledge and maintain that our Sins were the *quasi Causa Meritoria*, or *loco causæ meritoriæ* of his sufferings; and that he became Sin for us, that is, a Curse for Sin; that is, he made himself by his own Sponsion obnoxious to the Curse and Punishment due to us for our Sin: And so far Sin was imputed to him. But Christ was neither really a Sinner, nor esteemed of God so to be, and in that sence, sin was not imputed to him. 4. All know that *non Physico* Christ did not bear our persons. Some will needs extend the phrase, of [bearing or representing the person of another] *civiliter*,

liter, so far, as if it were applicable to every sponser, surety, or one that *alterius vice & loco*, doth do or suffer any thing: And so they say, [Christ bore our Person]: But as I think they abuse the phrase, by extending it so far; so I am content they use their liberty to express themselves as they please: only I intreat them that they misunderstand not me; but know that my meaning is, that [the Law doth not look on any Man, no not the Elect as having either satisfyed or suffered in or by Christ; nor doth the Law-giver and judge so look on him: And so Christ did not strictly in Law-Sense bear the person of any Man in suffering, so as that person might be said to have in him suffered]. 6. Some think Christ in suffering the penalty, as penalty, did strictly bear our persons as Sinners; but not as this suffering was a satisfaction to Gods Justice which is the effect of it, much less as it was meritorious of further Grace and Salvation. The Authors or owners of this opinion (of whom *Arminius* himself seems one) discerned the inconveniences that would follow the opinion of strict Representation; but while they discerned not the right way of avoiding them, and feared lest they should swarve by a full denial of it, they seem to me to fall into the same place from which they leaped. Though I confess that at the first view I began to incline to this opinion, as most moderate, which now I see to be unsafe.

The most of my Arguments are drawn from those intollerable consequences of the Doctrine which I oppose, as being such as overthrow the very substance of the Gospel. Though to the inconsiderate it may seem a small matter.

Argumen

1. *Argument* That Doctrine which consequentially denyeth all Pardon of Sin, is not of God: But such is the Doctrine which I here oppose: Therefore, &c.

The Minor only requires proof.

Where the proper debt is discharged, or penalty undergone in Law-Sence by the person himself who was obnoxious, there is no room for Pardon to such a Person: But according to the Doctrine which I oppose, the proper debt is discharged, or the penalty undergone, in Law-Sence by the Person himself who was obnoxious: Therefore according to that Doctrine, there is no place for Pardon to such.

The Minor needs no proof, it being the express terms of the assertion which I deny, that Christ so represented our Persons in suffering or satisfying, as that *Legaliter vel Civiliter* we may properly be said to have suffered or satisfied in him; so that though it was Christs Person naturally, yet it was ours Legally, Morally or Imputatively.

The major I prove thus. He that oweth nothing, or to whom no penalty is due, can have none forgiven him: But he that hath paid all the debt, or undergone all the punishment that was due, by himself or another that in Law-Sence is himself, doth owe nothing, or to him no penalty due: Therefore he can have none forgiven him. *Prob. Major*, *Remissio est Debiti Remissio*; Therefore where there is no due, there can be no remission *Prob. Minor* To have paid or suffered all, and to owe some, are contradictory and inconsistent. Therefore he that hath paid all, owes nothing.

The Antimonians Answer is this. It is true that no punishment is due to the Elect, and none is properly forgiven them now since Christs Death: But Christs assuming their Persons in satisfying, was a Remission to them: Or God did in one instant remit it to them and transfer it on Christ. Reply. 1. Christs assuming our Persons is not remission of Sin. 2. If God did remit it to us, when he transferred it on Christ, and yet we *Legaliter*, suffered in Christ, then God did both remit the whole debt to us, and receive satisfaction in Law-Sence from us, at the same time: But that is a contradiction. Therefore, *&c.*

From hence I may therefore further argue.

2. *Arg.* That Doctrine which denyeth consequentially, that we must believe for remission of Sin, or that we are justified by Faith, any otherwise than in our own consciences, is not of God: But such is the Doctrine I oppose: Therefore, *&c.*

The Minor is proved already: For if either there be no such thing as pardon of Sin (which follows the point opposed) or as they say none but at the death of Christ, then the Minor is plain. The main scope of the Gospel confirms the Major. It is the command to believe for remission of Sin: It is the promise, that if we believe we shall be forgiven. It is the threatning, that he that believeth not shall not be forgiven and is condemned already, and the wrath of God abideth on him. And that it is not only in *foro conscientiæ* that Men are justified, (or as Mr. *Owen* speaks, terminated in conscience) I have fully proved by a multitude of Arguments in my Papers to Mr. *Law*, which therefore I will not now repeat.

Arg.

3. *Arg.* That Doctrine which denieth that great benefit of our Union with Christ is not of God; but such is that which I oppose: Therefore, *&c.*

Pardon and Justification flow from our Union with Christ (which is by faith): Therefore to deny them, is to deny a principal part of the benefit of that our Union with him.

4. *Arg.* That Doctrine which destroyeth a main end of Baptism is not of God. But such is this opposed. Therefore, *&c.*

Prob. Min. We are Baptized for Remission of Sin (that is, by sealing more fully to exhibite and confirm our Law Title to Remission): But this overthroweth Remission (at least as the end of Baptism).

5. *Arg.* That Doctrine which destroyeth Prayer for the Pardon of Sins, yea and teacheth Men not to be thankful for Pardon, nor to acknowledg themselves beholden to God for it, nor to need it; is not of God. But such is this opposed. Therefore, *&c.* For if it deny pardon, it must needs deny Prayer for it, and thanks, *&c.*

6. *Arg.* That Doctrine which maketh Men to be in Christ before they believe, or are entered into his Covenant, is not of God: But such is this opposed: Therefore, *&c.* The Major is plain from the Scope of the Gospel: And if it were needful I might cite an hundred Texts, which shew that unbelievers are not in Christ, that

that it is by Faith that we are his Members, and Children of God? and not in him till then. The Minor is plain, that they make all the Elect to have been in *Law* Sence in Christ dying and satisfying; and so make the Members of Harlots and Satan Members of Christ.

7. *Arg.* That Doctrine is not of God, which maketh wicked Unbelievers to be in Gods special favour as reconciled, and from under his wrath, and *quite* out of debt to him, as to any due punishment. But such is this opposed. Therefore, *&c.*

Prob. Major. The Scripture saith that we are by nature Children of wrath; that unbelievers are condemned already; and the wrath of God abideth on them; that God hateth all the workers of iniquity; that he that justifieth the unrighteous is abomination to him; that Men must repent, believe, be Baptized and pray for Pardon, that we are justified by Faith. Therefore the contrary Doctrine is not of God.
The Minor's confessed.

8. *Arg.* That Doctrine is not of God, which consequentially denieth the Justice of his Judgments: But such is this opposed. Therefore, *&c.*

Prob. Min. That Doctrine which chargeth God with punishing those that have made him full payment, doth consequentially deny the justice of his Judgments. But such is the Doctrine in question. Therefore, *&c.* 1. That it teacheth that we have fully paid the debt in Christ, is past question: 2. that God punisheth the Elect

1. Is

1. Is put out of doubt by frequent expreſs teſtimony of Scripture, 2. And is confeſsed by themſelves as many as are of competent underſtanding, and moderation. For 1. that paternal Chaſtiſements is a *ſpecies* of puniſhment, is known to all that know what puniſhment is; *viz. Malum Paſſionis propter malum culpæ: Vel privatio boni naturalis propter privationem boni moralis:* Or ſuffering inflicted for a fault. 2. However, I have met with few of an ordinary underſtanding, that will deny that God puniſheth his Elect, before, Converſion, while they are Children of wrath, and condemned already, and under the Curſe of the Law.

The Major is alſo plain. It is injuſtice to puniſh thoſe to whom no puniſhment is *due*: But no puniſhment is due to them that have fully ſuffered for all Sin: Therefore to puniſh them that have ſo ſuffered is injuſtice. I know God is abſolute Lord of the Creature, and therefore may in that regard uſe them as he pleaſe: And therefore I ſay, as *Twiſſe*, that he may without injuſtice torment or afflict the moſt innocent Creature, (ſuppoſing him not to have promiſed the contrary, and to be only *Dominus, & non Rector*): But (ſaith *Twiſſe*) he cannot puniſh the innocent: For that is a contradiction and ſo impoſſible. For all puniſhment is for ſin. Affliction is but the matter of puniſhment and not the form. Beſides; God being Rector of the reaſonable Creature, and having expreſſed in his Laws, that he will not puniſh Men that deſerve it not, it is not to be charged on him. If any ſay, God is not capable of injuſtice, if you ſhould ſuppoſe the breach of his promiſe? I ſay, 1. as *Abraham Gen.* 18. 25. that

that be far from thee to do after this manner, to slay the Righteous with the wicked, and that the Righteous should be as the wicked; that be far from thee: Shall not the judge of all the Earth do Right? 2. We cannot suppose God to reconcile contradictions: Such it is to punish the Innocent.

And that those who have made full payment or suffered all that was due are not guilty, *i. e. obligati ad pœnam* is past dispute.

9. *Arg.* That Doctrine is not true which saith of the wicked, He is Righteous: But such is this opposed. Therefore, *&c. Prob. Major. Prov.* 24. 24. He that saith to the wicked thou art Righteous, Nations shall Curse him, People shall abhor him. *Prob. Minor.* He that hath fully satisfied for all Sin, is Righteous: But according to this Doctrine, the wicked have fully satisfied for all their Sin: Therefore, *&c. Prob. Major.* He that hath satisfied for all, oweth nothing, as to punishment and therefore is Righteous. What Law can require more then all? Or what justice can refuse to acquit him that hath paid all that was due? Or to justifie him if he be accused as liable to punishment? If any on the old grounds shall say, that besides the Righteousness Negative, (which is not guilty of punishment) there is requisite a positive righteousness, to give Right to the reward, and this they want. I reply 1. One righteousness, doth both, I think. 2. If it were not so yet Christs satisfaction is meritorious of the reward. 3. If that were not so, yet remember, that the same Men that object this, do teach also, that Christ did as strictly represent us in obeying; and that

that in him we fulfilled the Law 4. If that were not ſo, yet it croſſeth the Scripture to call the wicked Righteous, in the firſt Sence, *i. e. non reos ſæna Pprob Minor.* They ſay, all the elect have ſatisfied in Chriſt. But multitudes of the Elect are wicked. Therefore, *&c. Prob. Minor.* He he that doth wickedneſs is wicked, and is of the Devil, ſaith the Apoſtle: But ſuch are many of the Elect before Converſion: Therefore, *&c.* This argument is in ſence, but the ſame with the 7th, but that the terms differ, *John* ſaith, He that doth Righteouſneſs is Righteous, and this Doctrine ſaith conſequentially, He that never did Righteouſneſs is Righteous. *Paul* ſaith, His Servants ye are to whom ye obey, whether of Sin unto death or of obedience unto Righteouſneſs. But this Doctrine ſaith, conſequently, His friends ye are whom you never obeyed; and that the Elect before converſion, who obey the Devil, and ſo are his Servants, and never had obedience unto Righteouſneſs, are yet Righteous, as having paid all their debt.

10 *Arg.* That Doctrine which denieth Chriſts *Satisfaction* for us in ſtrict Sence, is not of God: But ſuch is this oppoſed. Therefore, *&c.* The Major is plain. *Prob. Minor.* That Doctrine which affirmeth Chriſts ſufferings to have been the *Idem* which was required by the Law, and not the *Tantundem*, doth deny ſatisfaction in ſtrict Sence: But ſo doth this oppoſed: Therefore, *&c.* The Major is proved by the definition of ſatisfaction; which ſtrictly taken, is *Redditio æqui valentis*, as *Scotus* and other Schoolmen, and *Ameſius* (*contra Bellar*) from them approving it) or it is, *ſolutio tantidem*,

dem, as *Grotius* and others, and is distinct from *solutio ejusdem*, which is *solutio strictè sic dicta*. *Minor. Prob.* They that affirm us to have suffered all that the Law required, do affirm us consequently to have suffered the *Idem*, and not meerly the *tantundem*. But so do they that teach, that we suffered in Christ, *&c.* Therefore, *&c.* More of this anon

11. *Arg.* Christ suffered and satisfied in the Person of Mediator; therefore not in the Person of the Elect or Offender: Because a mediator is a middle person, and Christ sustained not two persons as a sufferer.

12. *Arg.* The Scripture oft speaks of Christs taking on him our nature, and our Sins, but not (in suffering) our person: Therefore it is not to be affirmed, *Isa.* 53. *&c.*

13. *Arg.* That Doctrine is not tollerable which makes Man his own Redeemer, or to have satisfied or suffered for his own Sins: But such this seems therefore, *&c.* For if the Law say, that we satisfied in Christ, then in Law Sence, we satisfied for own Sins, and consequently redeemed our selves.

As for their Objection, that no other way but representing our persons could suffice to save us by the satisfaction of another; it is a gross mistake and naked affirmation without proof.

And for them that say, Christ *suffered* in *persona nostra*, but not *satisfied or merited* so: I answer. They speak inconsistencies: Satisfaction and Merit are necessary results from the nature of the suffering considered with the Dignity of the

the Person, and the Divine acceptance. Now if Christ suffered not in his own person, whose dignity was to communicate a value to his sufferings, then his sufferings are defective in their value. And if we did in Christ or by him suffer all that was due, it is impossible but God should take that suffering for satisfactory, in the larger Sence, it being *solutio ipsius debiti*, in strict Sence. So that if the Law or Law-giver say, the Elect suffered in Christ; they must needs say, the elect satisfied in Christ, or rather paid the debt of the due punishment. And this God could not but accept, (*consequenter ad Leges*) For who can refuse the proper debt? Or deny an acquittance to him that dischargeth it? But from a sponsor he might have refused it.

I might add many more Arguments, were it needful. As from the dishonour that this will cast on Gods Law, in threatning those that have satisfied it already; in offering pardon and justification on conditions, to those that were justified without pardon, 1600. years ago. For a condition suspendeth the benefit till it be performed: But no justice can suspend his justification who hath discharged all the debt. What can be required more then all? Also that the Covenant or Testament should be Gods Deed of Gift, or Instrument of conveying Right, to that which is our own already, 1600. years ago. Also the Gospel saith, our Life is in the Son, and all is delivered, into his Hands; but this putteth our Rights in our own Hands, even when we have no being. Also according to this Doctrine Men were justified before they were Men, and acquitted from all Sin, before they were born or had committed Sin: And

so

so Sinners that were no Men and consequently no Sinners, were acquitted from Sin that was not, and consequently was no Sin.

CHAP. V.

Prop. 2: *Christs sufferings for Mans Sins, were not the* Idem, *the same thing which the Law threatned to us: Or the fulfilling of the threatening, and discharge of the debt it self in kind. But the Æquivalens, or Value, freely paid by him (obliged only by his own sponsion,) and accepted by God, for our not fulfilling the Law as to its Precept and Commination.*

SOme think this Question whether Christ paid the *Idem* or *Tantundem*? To be not *Tantidem*, not worth the disputing. Mr. *O*, (against me) seems stifly to maintain it to be the *Idem*, but yielding it to be not *per eundem*, and the Law to be Relaxed so far, doth yield as much as I need, and gives up the whole cause; and made me think it a useless labour to reply to him. As small as this Question seems, I think the main Body of Divinity stands or falls according to the Resolution of it. For understanding the meaning of it, you must know, 1. That it is not of the quality of the suffering that we enquire: Whether Christ suffered the same kind of pain, or loss that we should have suffered? Nor of the quantity of Torment, for intension or duration? For I am willing to believe as much identity in

these

these as I can see any ground but of probability to encourage me: Though yet I know how hard it is, for them that say, by [Death] in the threatning, was meant, Death, Temporal, Spiritual, and Eternal, to prove that the loss of Gods Image was none of the penalty; (for I hope none will say, that Christ lost Gods Image) or that Christs temporary sufferings, were the *Idem* with our Eternal, *quoad quantitatem*; and not the want of duration made up by the intension, or dignity of the person, as being Æquivalent: (Which is our ordinary Doctrine, and I think sound): Or yet that the Eternity of the punishment was not in the threatning, but was accidental: Either, as some Schoolmen think, for want of power to deliver or overcome; or as others (and with them *Parker* and *Sanford*, I think, not soundly) because of the everlastingness of Sinning. I think none of these much worth the disputing, comparatively: Nor 2. is it *de persona naturali*, who he was naturally that paid the debt, or made the satisfaction. It is not therefore *de materia debiti*, that we enquire, but *de formâ*: Whether it were the same formally which we owed, and the obligation required? Or only the Value, and not the same full debt? Also you must know that, though we may well use the word [debt] in this Case, because the Scripture doth, yet we must acknowledg it but a Metaphor, and the proper terms are, whether Christs sufferings were the same thing that the Law in its threatning required, i. e. obliged unto, and made due? And so a fulfilling of that threatning? And this with great averseness I deny. The question is determined on the determination of the former, having ne-

cessary

ceſſary dependance on it, and being *tantum non* in Sence the ſame. And therefore all the Arguments which I uſed for the former will ſerve to this; and therefore I need not repeat any of them, but refer you to them. deſiring you to peruſe them and apply them to this; for all the ſame abſurdities (or neer all) do follow upon this as on the other. Indeed theſe two together (that Chriſt paid the *Idem*, the debt it ſelf and not the value, by perſonating us in his ſufferings, ſo that in Law Sence, we ſatisfied in him) are the very foundation of the whole frame of that Religion commonly called *Antinomian*, but much more fitly Anti-evangelical. To touch again on ſome few. It is evident that this Doctrine utterly deſtroyeth all poſſibility of pardon of Sin, and conſequently all repenting and believing, praying for pardon, all thankfulneſs for it, all Teſtamental or Evangelical Conveyance of it by the promiſe, all Goſpel and Miniſterial tenders of pardon; all Sacramental exhibition and obſignation of pardon; and a Chriſtians enquiries, examination, and ſeekings after pardon, and his comforts living or dying in aſſurance of pardon; and inſtead of all, aſſerteth us ſo righteous, that we need no pardon. You will ſure confeſs, that if this will follow, then almoſt all Religion is overthrown at a blow. And that it follows, ſeems to me paſt doubt. For what can any Law in the World require or any Lawgiver, in exacteſt juſtice, but that the Law be perfectly fulfilled? What can any creditor require, but the *Idem*, the very debt it ſelf which the obligation did contain? Can he have all his debt, and remit it too? Is the obligation fulfilled, and remitted or relaxed too?

too? Doth the Judg execute all the penalty, and yet forgive it? Is not he unjust that denieth him an acquittance and the cancelling of the obligation, who hath fully paid him all his due? If any shall conceive, with the *Socinians*, that the same inconveniences will follow, upon the asserting of Christs full satisfaction for us, I answer, Not one of them: Nay there is no way, I think, but this that I now maintain to confute a *Socinian*, and defend Christs satisfaction. Were it well used, it is a Key into a great part of the Body of Divinity, and helpeth to resolve solidly and satisfactorily a multitude of difficult objections, which without this admit not of solution (though Mr. *O.* call it my πρῶτον ψεῦδος) The *Idem*, or full debt or suffering, is *solutio non recusabilis* the Value in another kind or way, is *solutio recusabilis*, (*stricte dicta satisfactio*) more plainly, the proper penalty, which is *supplicium delinquentis*, is all that can be required to satisfie the Legislator or Law: But that an innocent person should suffer for our Sins, is *quid Recusabile*; the Legislator may refuse it. If therefore we had paid the *Idem*, the very debt we had been acquitted or to be acquitted *ipso facto*, as presently righteous, without Remission; but when another pays it (even the Son of the Law-giver sent by his own Love and Mercy, who is neerer him then us) these two things follow, 1. That the supream Rector may accept it on what terms he please, or not accept it: And that accordingly God did accept it on terms most fitted to his blessed ends in governing the World: Among others, that Man should have the special benefits of this satisfaction conveyed to them only in a legal way, in time, on such and such terms or con-

ditions, as he saw meet, and as is expressed in the tenor of the Covenant of Grace. *&c.* Nay it was the desire of Christ the satisfier, that these Benefits should only thus be conveyed to the Redeemer: That so though the Impetration were wholly by him, and absolutely wrought, yet the Application might be in part by themselves and conditional; and the mercy might not cross Gods ends by making them independent and secure, but might further his ends, in drawing them to him, and engaging them to repent, believe, seek, strive, fear, care, *&c.*

If the *Idem*, were paid, that is, the delinquent himself had suffered, there had needed no New Covenant, to apply the Benefits, or convey them: But now there doth.

Object. *But it may be the* Idem, *the full due, though not* per eundum, *by the same person.*

Ans. Distinguish (as before) between the *Idem Materialiter* and *Formaliter*, also between the full debt and a Part. And so, if it were a debt of Money or the like 1. It may be fully the same materially, and not formally: As a Man may steal that same Money which you owe another, and pay it to that other as his own debt: 2. Here you must distinguish between *Personam Naturalem & Civilem vel Legalem*: If you pay all that was in the obligation, by your Servant, Friend or any Delegate or Vicar, the Law will say, you have paid it your self. It was your delegates person naturally, but yours Legally or rather your Instrument, Because the obligation required but the thing to be paid in your Name, by

by what hand soever; and so you are acquitted without remission: For you have discharged the proper debt, and the Creditor can demand no more.

But now in Criminals its otherwise: Because the very Person offending is in the obligation as the subject of the penalty: *Noxa Caput sequitur.* So that *formaliter* it is not the suffering which was due to you, which another suffers for you. This I add as a main Argument for my proposition.

If the Law do require only *supplicium ipsius delinquentis*, then Christs sufferings were not the *Idem*, the same thing which the Law required: Nor is the Law fulfilled thereby. But the Law doth require only *supplicium ipsius delinquentis*: Therefore, &c. For the Major, or its consequence it needs no proof; for Christ was not *ipse delinquens*; He was made Sin, that is, one punishable and punished for Sin; but not really, nor in Law a Sinner. The Law never took any Man for a Sinner that did not Sin. Of this more anon. The Minor is proved from the words of the Law [*In the Day thou eatest thou shalt dye*] [Cursed is he that continueth not in all things] It saith, [Thou shalt dye] not [another shall dye] for them that say, It means [thou or thy surety] 1. They add to Gods Law, out of their own Brain, 2. They make the Law to know a surety before Sin; 3. They confound hereby Law and Gospel: For it is only the Gospel that revealed a surety. 4. They make the Law to Curse the innocent, and to threaten Christ for our Sin dangerously 5. They make Christ a surety *à parte ante*, and not *ex post facto*, and so corrupt the Doctrine

ctrine of his Office. Let them therefore prove it before they affirm it. I conclude therefore in this case (as *Grotius*, *Essenius*, &c.) *Dum alius solvit, simul aliud solvitur.* And therefore Mr. *O.* and others that grant *alius solvit*, must needs grant that *aliud solvitur.* It was us and not Christ that the Law threatned, and therefore it is not Christs sufferings that is the *Idem*, the thing threatned, but ours; nor that is a proper fulfilling of the commination in the execution. So that the obligation is not *ipso facto*, in justice void on Christs satisfaction, as it would have been on our payment (had ours been possible,) and on the payment of the proper Debt.

Again I argue, as before; that is not true Doctrine which denyeth Christs proper satisfaction: But so doth the opposed Doctrine directly. *Ergo*, &c.

For *satisfactio* (*stricte sumpta*) & *solutio stricte sumpta*, are thus different; *satisfactio* is *solutio tantidem*, & *solutio stricte sumpta est ejusdem.* He therefore that affirmeth that Christ paid our proper Debt, denyeth him to have made proper satisfaction for our non-payment.

Lest you should think me singular herein, I think it meet to shew you in some few Testimonies, what our greatest Divines say in this point.

1. Great *Camero* saith, (*page* 363 *Operum folio.*) *Objectio qui pro alio satisfecit, is solvit quod ille debet At Christus non solvit quod nos debebamus: Ergo Resp. Ad majorem per distinctionem: Id solvit quod alius debet Pondere & Valore, concedo: Id solvit specie, nego. Jam vero Christus id solvit quod nos debebamus, pondere & valore; quod satis est.*

2. *Rivet*

2. *Rivet Diſput. de ſatisfact. pag.* 253, 254. &c. that which he diſputeth for the Laws Relaxation, makes wholly for this.

3. Mr. *Ball* of the Covenant, *page* 290. There is a twofold payment of Debt: One of the thing altogether the ſame which was in the Obligation; and this *ipſo facto* freeth from Puniſhment, whether it be paid by the Debtor himſelf, or by his Surety. Another of a thing not altogether the ſame which is in the Obligation, ſo that ſome act of the Creditor or Governour muſt come unto it, which is called Remiſſion: in which Caſe deliverance doth not follow *ipſo facto*, upon the ſatisfaction. And of this kind is the ſatisfaction of Chriſt.

4. *Grotius* in his Excellent Treatiſe *De ſatisfactione*, hath the ſame more fully.

5. *Eſſenius* defendeth it in *Grotius* againſt the cavils of *Crellius* at large.

6. *Biſſon* of Chriſts Deſcent, *page* 45. and 262. (as cited by *Parker.*)

7. And *Parker* that oppoſeth him, ſaith as much as I do: *de Deſcenſu Chriſti, lib.* 3. *page* 108, 109.

Argu. 2. If Chriſt paid the *Idem*, or fulfilled the Laws threat, then we who were the perſons obliged, may be truely ſaid to have fulfilled it in him. But that is falſe, therefore I mean the Law is not fulfilled by Chriſts Sufferings. Of which ſee the next Queſtion.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Prop. III. *It was not the Law it self properly that Christ satisfied, but the Legislator, as above Law.*

FOR the understanding of this, you must distinguish between fulfilling the Law, and satisfying for not fulfilling: Between fulfilling the the Precept and the Commination; between satisfaction largly taken, *pro desiderij implettone*; and stricty taken *pro solutione æquivalentis*; and between the Law it self, and its end. And so I say, 1. Man fulfilled not the Precept of the Law, 2. Nor is the threatning perfectly fulfilled on man by God; specially on the saved. 3. The suffering of the penalty may be called satisfaction of the Law, as to the Precepts; that is, the Law is satisfied for our violation of its commands; but as to the threatning, it is properly the fulfilling of it. 4. Christ did fulfil the precept of the Law in his own personal perfect obedience, and so was himself Righteous *quoad continuationem*, being initially Righteous before, from his conception. 5. Christ did not fulfil the threatning of the Law as to himself, for it did not threaten him. 6. Christ did not fulfil the threatning of the Law, as to us; for that had been nothing else but to Damn us all. 7. Christ might improperly be said to satisfie the ends of the Law: I mean the remote

remote Ends which are not Essential to it; but not the immediate neareſt end, which entereth its diſinition; *viz.* The *terminus*: The *Debitum Pœnæ pro comminationem Constitutum.* God made Laws to rule men, and therein by threatnings expreſſeth his hatred of Sin, *&c.* This is as fully expreſſed in the ſufferings of Chriſt, as if the threat had been fulfilled. 8. Chriſt did not ſatisfie the Law it ſelf. (I mean the ſence of the Law,) but the Legiſlator. This is it which I muſt prove, having firſt removed this Objection.

Object. *The end of Law, is the Law: But Chriſt ſatisfied the End of the Law:* Ergo, &c.

Anſw. The next end, called the *terminus*, enters the definition in Relations. This Chriſt did not ſatisfie. The Law did conſtitute the dueneſs of our perſonal puniſhment (which is remitted) but not Chriſts puniſhment (which was ſuffered) The remote ends of the Law, are not truly the Law but proverbially ſo called by ſome. The letter and ſence, is the Law, and not thoſe ends. Now that Chriſt ſatisfied not the Law, I prove thus.

Argu. 1. If the Law know no ſatisfaction, (or be capable of none) but the fulfilling of it, (which is not ſtrictly ſatisfaction) then Chriſts ſufferings were no ſatisfaction to the Law. But the Law knoweth no other, *Ergo, &c.*

We doubt not of his fulfilling the Precept himſelf, but that is not ſatisfaction to the Law directly.

rectly and properly for anothers violation of it. The Major is unquestionable if we prove that Christ fulfilled not the threat: And that I have done already.

1. If Christ was not threatned by the Law, (or if it threatned none but *ipsum delinquentem*;) then Christs sufferings were not the fulfilling of the threat: (for he was not the *delinquent*) But, *&c. Ergo*, &c.

2. If Christ therefore suffered to relax the Law, and that its threatning might not be fulfilled, then his sufferings were not the fulfilling of the Law. But, *&c. Ergo*, &c. *Prob. Min.* that the Law knoweth no other satisfaction, but fulfilling.

Argu. 1. Satisfaction strictly (as distinct from fulfilling) is *Redditio aquivalentis.* But the Law, (as continuing the same) cannot commute or substitute the *aquivalens vel tantundem*, for the *Idem* or proper Debt.

2. It is essential to the Law to constitute the *Debitum vel officij vel Pœna.* But it constitutes not the *Debitum alterius speciei, vel tantidem*; (else it should confound the *ipsum debitum* with the *aquivalens.*) The Law never imposed it on Christ to satisfie for our sins: This was the obligation of his own Sponsion.

3. Satisfaction which is the giving of the value for the proper Debt, implyeth a relaxation of the Law to its acceptance: But the Law cannot relax it self. *Ergo*, &c.

4. To admit of satisfaction, is the Act of the Lawgiver or Rector, as he is above Law; therefore

fore it is no act of the Law. As to make a Law, to pardon an Offender, to abrogate a Law, &c. are acts of one above the Law, so is the relaxing of the Law in pardoning the Sinner, and taking Christs sufferings for ours. Can any obligation dissolve or remit it self?

5. If the Law did neither threaten Christ in the first enacting of it, nor hath power to change it self since, by assuming another sense, then Christs sufferings were neither a fulfilling nor satisfaction to the Law. *At verum prius Ergo.* If the name of Christ were put into the threatning after the Law was made, then the Law was changed, and so is not the same; and it could not change it self. Indeed if another for you pay a Debt, the Bond is satisfied, because it was the *ipsum debitum.* But if another will bear the Death that you deserve, the Law that threatens you is not satisfied nor fulfilled; But the Law-giver is satisfied, and the ends of the Law attained. But here note, that this relaxation and non fulfilling of the Law, is not total and absolute; nor such as derogateth at all from the honour of the Law or Lawgiver; but it is a relaxation upon such terms as preserve both fully; the full weight of the threatned Punishment being born or undertaken by the Son of God, before God would relax his Law.

6. To this and the two former together, I add: If the Laws Commination be fulfilled, or if Christ suffered the same that was threatned, or if we satisfied fully in Christ, then we are not by that Law obliged to obedience during this Life. But the consequent is false *Ergo*, &c.

The

The reason of the consequence is this. The Law obligeth *aut ad obedientiam, aut ad panam*, disjunctively *pro eodem tempore*, and not *& ad obedientiam & ad panam*. Now Christ hath satisfied for our sin not only against the Law of Works by *Adam*, but against all Laws of Nature or Grace since, except the non-performance of the condition of the new Covenant, and this to our Death. So that if we have in Christ fully satisfied the threatning for all sin in this Life, then we cannot be bound by the Precept after such satisfaction, till after this Life be ended. To say we are not obliged to the same Ends, is no answer: For that Law can oblige us to no ends, which is fulfilled already, and which did never oblige but *aut ad obedientiam, aut panam propter obedientia defectum.*

CHAP. VII.

Prop. IV. *It was not only the Sins of the Elect, but of all, even Elect and Non-elect which were the* pro-causa meritoria *of Christs sufferings. Or it was not only the Sufferings Due to the Sins of the Elect, but of all, which Christ did undergo. And accordingly hath made satisfaction for all.*

IT is necessary that we speak of the efficient Causes of Christs Death, before we handle the Effects. And therefore we must consider *quorum loco* he Dyed, before we consider how far they shall partake of the Benefits. Here it must be remembred, that we have already proved that Christ

Christ did not represent our Persons in satisfying; but yet he bore our sins, that is, the penalty due to them; and so did in a larger sence suffer *nostro loco* or *nostri loco*; not as our Delegate or proper *Vicarius*; but as a voluntary Sponsor, and so substitute in suffering.

Also understand that Christs sufferings had no real proper meritorious Cause: But yet Mans sins were the *pro-causa meritoria*: He undertook to bear that suffering which for them was due to us, (not to him.) And therefore when I say he bore the sufferings due to us, I mean it *materialiter* only; such sufferings for kind and weight he bore; but his obligation to bear them was only from his own Sponsion, and not the Law. The Law by constituting the Dueness of punishment to us, was the occasion of his suffering it, but not the obliging cause. I add, that [accordingly he hath satisfied for all:] For this will not be denyed, if the first be proved. For he satisfied by suffering what the Sinner deserved: And in whose stead soever he suffered, for them he satisfied.

Now I shall think it meet to stand the longer on this point, because the decision of the main Question [Whether Christ dyed for all men?] dependeth mainly on it. For the strictest sence in which he is said to die for men, is, to die in their stead; or to Die for their Sins as the procuring Cause, on his own undertaking. Yield this once, and we shall much easilier agree on the second Part, *Pro quorum beneficio*, or what the benefits be which Christ hath procured to all. At least, no man will think it unmeet to say, that [Christ died for all men] if we can prove that

that he dyed for the sins, and in the stead of all, and satisfied Gods Justice for all. And if he dyed for them, it is certain that he satisfied for them (as is said) because God doth neither require nor accept the Death of his Righteous Son, but as it is necessary to the satisfaction of his justice for Sin

Lastly, remember that I put the word [all] as contradistinct from the Elect: pleading specially against them that would confine Christs satisfaction only to the Elect: Not that I doubt of Christs sufferings for all, in the utmost universality, but I think it far safer to dispute it as to all that hear the Gospel: For God hath plainlier shewed us how he dealeth with these than the rest; and it is not fair nor profitable to carry the disputation into the obscurest part, to lose it rather than determine it: And if any agree with me in this that I prove: [That Christ satisfied for all that hear the Gospel.] I will not trouble them with disputing it about the rest, but willingly let them enjoy their opinion, (though contrary to mine) as judging it to be to us of far lesser moment My Arguments shall be first from the scope of Scripture Doctrine; and 2. From some particular Texts, which expresly assert Universal Satisfaction, or Christs Dying for all: And then I shall answer the contrary Arguments.

This First Argument shall be *A conditionali remissione, & Jure ad Regnum cælorum omnibus per Testamentum Christi donatis.*

Argum. I. If all men have a Conditional Pardon, Justification, Adoption and Right to Glory, given to them by the New Testament, then Christ suffered and satisfied for all. But the Antecedent is

is true, therefore so is the consequent. I add by way of Explication, that the Condition is no Natural impossibility, or unreasonable thing; but Faith in Christ, or the accepting of the good that is bestowed and offered them; which is such a condition that many Learned Divines (who incline to the *Antinomian* way) say it is no condition, but it is equivalent to an absolute gift; and that it is so Naturally necessary that in the most absolute gift, acceptance is still supposed; and that it is all one to say [I will give thee this benefit] and [I will give it thee if thou wilt take it.] I am not of their mind, as to the case in hand; but hereby it may appear how reasonable Gods condition is, when Learned Men do take his gift to be absolute or equivalent.

The Antecedent is proved by multitudes of expres Texts of Scripture, *John* 3. 16. *God so loved the World that he gave*, &c. *That whosoever believeth*, &c. 1 John 5. 10, 11. *He that believeth not God hath made him a Lyar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record; that God hath given to us Eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son: He that hath the Son hath Life, and he that hath not the Son hath not Life.* Mark 16. 15, 16. *Go ye into all the World and Preach the Gospel to every Creature: He that Beleeth and is Baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.* John 7. 37, 38. *If any man thirst let him come to me and Drink: He that believeth on me*, &c. Acts 13. 39. *By him all that believe are Justified*, &c. Acts 16. 31. *Believe on the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be saved.* Rom. 3. 22, 23, 24. 25, 26. *Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through Faith in his*

his Blood, to declare, &c. *That he might be the Justifier of him that believeth in Jesus. Rom* 4. 24. *To whom it shall be imputed if we believe,* &c. Rom. 10. 6, 7, 8, 9. *But the Righteousness which is of Faith speaketh on this wise,* &c. *That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy Heart that God raised him from the Dead, thou shalt be saved.* Rev. 22. 17. *Whosoever will, let him take the Water of Life freely,* Act. 10. 43. 1 Pet. 2. 6. John 5. 24. and 6. 35. 40, 47. and 7. 38. with many the like.

Where note that these are in several respects called a Gift, a Promise, and an Offer. They are Christs Testament, and so properly his Deed of Gift, and do confer Right to the mentioned Benefits, conditionally first, and actual, and absolute when the condition is performed. And this is the principal consideration of them, that they are the Premiant act of the New Law, and the Testament of Christ, and his Deed of Gift. They are an Offer of Christ and these benefits, when they are applyed by promulgation to particular Sinners: And this Application or Offer is either by the meer terms of the Written Deed of Gift in Scripture; or else by the further proclamation by Christs Ministers and Officers. In the former sence, the Gift and the Offer are materially the same; but formally it is first Gods Conveyance or Deed of Gift, and then afterward in order of Nature, it is his Offer. It is Gods Written Instrument constituting a Conditional Right to Christ and his Benefits; but such an instrument is a proper Conveyance or Deed of Gift. And the conditional Right must be constituted before it can be offered: Or else the Offer

should

should be an act without its Object. But in regard of Actual Absolute Right, the offer is antecedent, and supposeth the thing offered not to be his to whom it is offered; but that the Condition of Acceptance must first be performed. Yea every man that is the owner himself who doth seriously offer a benefit to any man, without any meritorious or retaliating condition, but meerly to be accepted, doth *Eodem actu*, convey or give Right to that Benefit on the said condition. Now God doth offer his Son, 1. By his Written Instrument or Word, which must needs be his own act, and consequently his Gift as well as offer. 2. By his Messengers, whose act is morally his own act, in that he hath bid them say what they say, and commanded them to proclaim it to every Creature. It is called a Promise, not in respect to the Conditional Right but the Absolute, because it promiseth them that if they will accept Christ he shall be theirs with his benefits. And it doth not Promise that God will perform any other Natural Act for Conveiance of the benefit; but that by that same promising Instrument the Right shall be conveyed.

2. It is undeniable that this gift, offer or promise [If thou wilt believe thou shalt be saved] or [Whosoever will, let him take, *&c.*] is, made to unbelievers, as the Subject. We may not say to a Believer [If thou wilt believe thou shalt be saved] Except we speak of the continuance or renewal of Faith. It is properly to Unbelievers that God offers or gives Christ, so be it they will accept his gift. Now if it be to unbelievers, then it must needs be to all, Elect, and Non-

Non-elect: For the Promise makes no difference, nor the Minister knows no difference: God saith not [Thou Elect person shalt be saved if thou believe] For then no Man could apply the promise, nor know whether he have warrant to believe, as not knowing whether he be Elect: But he saith to any Man [If thou wilt believe thou shalt be saved.]

3. Either Christ and his benefits are given conditionally (on condition of believing) to all or to none. To the Non-elect, or not to the Elect. But they are given to some, even to the Elect: Therefore to all. The Major is evident in the tenour of the promise. 1. It is Universal, [Whosoever will] [Whosoeve believeth] It is no where limited to the Elect. 2. If it were limited to the Elect, it were useless, because none could know before believing whether he be Elect. Indeed the thing promised is proper to the Elect, and so is the Effectual, Actual, Donation, or Conveyance of Right by the promise: But that is not (as to the Sense of the promise) as they are Elect but as believers, or performers of the condition: And in this Sence only Believers are Heirs of the promise, that is, its effectual conveying act, and so to the thing promised.

But the Great doubt is of the *Minor* with some. For they deny that Christ is given conditionally to any Unbeliever Elect or not Elect; but only is decreed for the Elect before time, and given to Believers in time. The Sence is; that there is no conditional promise or deed of Gift, but all absolute. For if it be made only to Men that do believe, their first believing cannot be

be the condition; and if it be made on condtion of First believing, it is made to Men that do not yet believe. But the main Scope of the Gospel proves the Minor, by proving the conditional Gift, or promise: As the Texts even now cited, among others. Where note (to put it out of doubt) 1. That the time of Gods enacting this *Law*, or making this Testament, Gift or promise, was before we were born and therefore before we believed. 2. that in its nature, it first speaks to unbelievers as its Subject. For who will offer a gift to us to be accepted that it may be ours, if we have accepted it already? Nay how can it be accepted before it is offered? And how can we content to have Christ and so be united to him, except he first give himself to us on condition that we will consent? 3. Note, that the promise is made in most proper conditional terms [If thou confess with thy Mouth and believe in thy heart, *Rom.* 10.] That whosoever believeth should not perish, *&c.* 4. And also note that faith hath here the Definition of a condition agreeing to it, *i. e.* It is an Arbitrary act on which the free Donour hath suspended the efficacy of his Testament or Deed of Gift. (It is Arbitrary conditions that we have here to speak of, which some call Potestative: And not casual, or mixt.) So to suspend the effect of the Instrument, that *hoc posito efficiet, & donec ponatur non efficiet*, that upon the doing or not doing, the effect shall follow or not follow, and this by the positive ordination of the Donor is the very essence of a Condition in Law-sence. And such is Faith. And what Divine, except *Antinomians*, doth deny Faith to be the Condition? And

if it be so, then the Promise or Conditional Gift, must needs be made to Unbelievers (that it may become effectual when they believe:) For it can be no condition in this proper sence, if it be past already. And therefore it must needs be made to all Unbelievers seeing Scripture limiteth it not to any, but speaketh universally. Inded it is a very hard questionhow far the promulgation may be said to be Universal, and how far not: But that is nothing against the Universality of the Tenor of the Law or Gift. And the command to the Promulgators is, [*Go into all the World and Preach the Gospel to every Creature.*

Next let us prove the consequence of the *Major* Propositon; and that thus. *The thing conditionally given is Pardon purchased by Christs Blood, shed for the Sinner to whom it is Given: Therefore the gift presupposeth the shedding of his Blood for the Sinner.*

The Antecedent hath two branches to be proved. 1. That the Pardon conditionally given to all, is a pardon purchased by Christs Blood. 2. That it is by Christs blood as shed for him to whom that pardon is given. For the first, there is no Pardon given any other way but by Christs blood shed, therefore this is from his Blood shed.

1. If there be Remission which is not purchased by Christs blood shed, then there are two distinct ways of Remission; one by his blood, and another without. But the consequent is false. *Ergo*, &c.

2. I

2. If there be a remission without Christs bloodshed, then all remission might have been without it. But the consequent is false, else Christ Dyed needlesly.

3. *Heb.* 9. 22. Without shedding of Blood there is no Remission.

4 *Heb.* 9. 16. [For where a Testament is, there must also of necessity be the Death of the Testator.] But this conditional Gift is Christs Testament: So *ver.* 15. [For this cause he is the Mediator of the new Testament, that by means of Death for the Redemption of the Transgressions that were under the first Testament, they which are called might receive the promise of Eternal Inheritants;] *viz.* all that are externally called receive the conditional Promise, and Believers the thing promised.

5. *Luke* 24. 46, 47. [It behoved Christ to suffer and Rise from the Dead the third day, and that Repentance and Remission of Sins should be preached in his name among all Nations, *&c.*] So that even Remission Preached, that is, offered on condition of repentance, (and Faith) presupposeth Christs Death as the Cause.

6. In the Institution of his Supper, he calleth the Cup, the New Testament in his Blood, that is, this signifieth my Blood which procureth the new Testament. Now none sure dare say that the promise of Pardon and Life on condition of Believing is not the New Testament either whole or part.

7. And therefore it is called the Blood of the Covenant (even to them that tread it under foot) *Heb.* 10. 29. and 13. 20. *Zech.* 9. 11.

8. Justification is by Christs Blood, *Rom.* 5. 9. [*Being Justified by his Blood.*] But Justification is the Effect of this Conditional Covenant or Gift, (when the Condition is performed;) therefore the effect of this Covenant is from Christs blood, and consequently the Covenant it self which is an intermediate cause. Though there be other sorts of Justification, yet that this is one, and the first, is undenyable.

9. Actual Remission to Believers is from Christs Blood; (*Eph.* 1. 7. In whom we have Redemption through his Blood the remission of Sins, *Col.* 1. 14.) therefore conditional remission to unbelievers is from his Blood. The reason of the consequence is, that Christ procureth the Effect of Justification or Remission not immediately by his Blood as shed, but by procuring the Covenant or Promise as the immediate Cause, and the effect by that Cause; and it is the same Gift or Covenant which conditionally Justifieth all, and actually Justifieth Believers; and that without any other intervening act of God: When the condition is performed (whose Nature is to suspend the Effect) then the effect resulteth from the same Promise, which before did not effect. Indeed Christ giveth his Spirit to cause his Own to perform the condition; but still the justifying act is by the conditional Covenant. If therefore it be the same promise which effectually justifieth the Elect, and only conditionally justifieth others and Christs Blood causeth that promise which effectually justifieth the Elect, then his Blood caused that promise which conditionally justifieth all. *John* 3. 16. *God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son* (1. For men on the Cross

2. T

2. To men by the promise,) *that whosoever believe.* &c. So that this conditional grant of Life comes from the giving of Christ to Death.

And for the second part of the Antecedent, *viz.* That it is from Christs Blood as shed for him to whom the Promise is made. And 1. *Ab inefficacia*, Christs Dying for one man, cannot procure these great benefits to another. It cannot have causality as to such an effect. God doth not forgive *Thomas* because Christ Dyed for *Peter*. 2. *A non necessitate.* There was a necessity of Christs Death (as is before proved) to the procuring of this pardon. But there was no necessity for procuring pardon to one man, that Christ should Die for another; therefore the necessity was that he Dyed for the person himself. 3. If Christs Death were not necessary to the conditional pardoning of the Non-elect, (but that God doth it without Christs Dying for them; then it was not necessary for the conditional pardoning of the Elect, but God might have done it without Christs Dying for them: But the Consequent is false, therefore so is the Antecedent. The *Major* is plain in that there is the same reason both as to their Sin and Case, and Remission.

1. The Sins of the Elect did not differ from those of the Non-elect, so as that they more needed a satisfactory Expiation.

2 They were both under the same Law, Curse and Wrath of God.

3. The Deed of Gift, or Promise which remitteth one, is the same with that which remitteth the other. The *Minor* is plain, for if any could say, that without Christs Death, God might conditionally have pardoned all Elect and

Non-elect; but not Actually. I Answer. 1. Then Christ should Die only to purchase Faith: (which is false.) For God doth perform no new act to make the conditional Gift become actual, but only the giving of Grace to believe and so perform the condition. 2. Then God might have made this new Law and Covenant of Grace, [Believe and be pardoned and saved] or [*Whosoever will let him take the Water of Life freely*] without any expiatory Sacrifice or Satisfaction by Christ; which, 1. So contradicteth it self, (seeing the thing given is a Dead revived Saviour with his Benefits; and therefore it cannot be given which is not.) 2. And so subverteth Christianity it self, that I think I need not spend more words on it.

Only I add this (which is of considerable moment,) that on the contrary, the great necessity and ends of Christs Death are in respect to God as *Rector per leges*, and not as *Dominus absolutus*, or *benefactor merè arbitrarius*: God received no addition of Love, or Goodwill, nor of Wisdom, or Natural Power by Christs Death: But he received a Reparation of his honour as Legislator, and a Moral Power (consisting in *Convenientia rei efficiendæ*) to pardon sin by making a general act of pardon to all that will accept the Redeemer and his Benefits. So that the proper use of Christs Death was to be an Expiatory Sacrifice for Sin, offered to God as the offended Rector. And therefore the New Law or Covenant of Grace which followeth hereupon (giving Christ and Pardon to all that will Receive him) must needs be the proper effect of Christs Death. Whereas Faith is given rather by God as *Dominus Absolutus* arbitrarily

arbitrarily doing good to his Creature, then as Legislator; and is said to be purchased by Christs Death but in a more remote sense (as shall anon be shewed): so that to deny this Conditional Gift, Covenant or Promise to be the fruit of Christs satisfaction, is to deny a very great part of the fruit of it; and *tantum non* to make Christ to dye in vain.

The Consequence needs no proof, Therefore I pass to the next.

Arg. II. If God do offer (by his Word and Messengers) Remission, Justification, Adoption and Right to Glorification, to all (Elect and Non-Elect) then Christ hath satisfied for all. But God doth so offer these to All: *Ergo*, &c.

A Remissione & Salute omnibus Oblatis.

The former Argument was drawn from the Gift, and this is drawn from the *Offer:* which though it be inseparable from the former, and so implyed in the former Argument, yet I shall annex it because of them, who deny the Conditional Gift, but confess the Offer. The Antecedent I think few will question, as to All who hear the Gospel; and God as Legislator hath done his part in offering it to those that yet never heard it. 1. In making the Tenour of the Promise or Offer, of Universal extent. 2. And in Commanding his Officers to go into all the World and Preach the Gospel to every Creature.

The Consequent is proved thus. 1. The Pardon offered is either a Pardon purchased by Christs Satisfaction for them to whom it is offer-

ed; or else procured some other way: But there is no other way of procurement, *Ergo*, &c.

1. Not without Christs Blood as is proved.

2. Not by Christ's Blood as shed for others, as is proved.

Object. *But it is by his Blood as shed for all that will Believe.*

Ans. 1. Believing is not the Condition of Christs Dying for us; but of our participation of the benefits thereby purchased: not of the Impetration, but of part of the Application. Christ never said, If men (or this man) will Believe, I will dye for them; But, [If thou Believe thou shalt be justified and saved, by him that hath died for thee.] Belief is not presupposed as the Qualification of the subject for whom Christ must dye; but is required after, and given freely to his chosen, for the further Application of his Death.

2. His dying for them that will Believe, was either for certain determinate persons who should Believe; or else without a determination of the persons. If the latter only, then he died certainly for none. If the former then his dying for one man would not procure pardon for another.

2. God doth not offer that which he cannot give (for his offer is a gift, on condition of Acceptance: and we must not dare to charge God with illusory or ludicrous actions.) But God cannot give Pardon and Justification and Right to Salvation, to any sinful man for whom Christ never satisfied: When I say [God cannot] I mean

I mean not, that he cannot for want of Power, but because of his Wisdom, Goodness and Justice, He cannot (being Rector of the World) do that which is so Inconvenient, and such a Monster in Government, and so destructive to the ends of his Government: All grant that *quoad potentiam ordinatam* now he cannot: that is, He will not. If God may give these to one man, yea to All the Non-Elect to whom they are offered, without Christs satisfaction procuring them, then he may do so by all: but that is not true, *Ergo*, *&c.*

Object. *But if men will Believe God Can and Will give them what he offers.*

Answ. This Objection supposeth the Believing of that person for whom Christ died not, or else it changeth the subject of the question. For the Question now is, Whether God can give Pardon to a Man for whom Christ hath not satisfyed? And it is hereby answered, that He can if that man Believe? To which I reply, that he cannot, or will not, supposing that such a Man should believe. For it is Christs Death that is principally requisite, and that before Believing, without which all the Believing in the World will do no good. But some will say, It may not be supposed that a Non-Redeemed man should Believe. I say, it may well be supposed in dispute: But I shall have occasion fullier to answer this anon.

3. Contradictions are not to be charged upon God: But to offer pardon to one for whom no satisfacti-

satisfaction is made, (*Consideratis Considerandis*) is a contradiction, *Ergo*, &c. An effect without its necessary cause, is a contradiction: But a Pardon without satisfaction (which is the thing here supposed to be offered) is an effect without its necessary cause. *Ergo*, &c. The satisfaction must be given to God and Accepted by him, before the fruits of that satisfaction can be (seriously and in plain dealing) offered to the Sinner, that by Acceptance they may become his.

Arg. III. *A natura Objecti, viz. beneficii oblati.* If it be a Christ who hath satisfied for their sin, who is offered to men to be Received or Believed in, then Christ hath satisfied for the sins of all to whom God doth offer him. But it is [a Christ who hath satisfied for their sin] who is offered to men to be Received, *Ergo*, &c.

1. Here it will be easily yielded, I suppose, that Christ is offered to the Non-Elect. 2. That himself is the principal Object of this Faith, and his Benefits the consequential. 3. That he is offered to them as a Redeemer and Saviour. 4. That he doth not offer to Redeem them by suffering again. 5. That without suffering for them, he cannot be a Redeemer for them. 6. And therefore he is offered to apply the Benefits of his Death, by actual Justifying, Adopting, Sanctifying and Glorifying them. 7. And therefore it must needs follow, that it is presupposed the rest of the work is already done, *viz.* Satisfaction: Or else Christ is not offered to men as a Redeemer and sufficient Saviour; but he is offered to them for a Redeemer and sufficient Saviour; therefore as one that hath satisfied for them. For he never offered

offered to pardon any Man without satisfaction for his Sins first made. So that the contrary makes Christ either to be offered to Men not as a Redeemer and Saviour, or as one to redeem and save them without dying and satisfying for them both which are untrue and unsufferable Consequents.

Arg. 4th. *Ab effectu Universali ad Causam.* If all Men be delivered from the legal necessity of Perishing everlastingly, which was brought on them by the meer breach of the first rigorous Law, then Christ hath suffered and satisfied for all: But the Antecedent is true: Therefore so is the Consequent.

I suppose none will question the Major proposition, *i.e.* the Consequence: Or imagine that there is any other way of freedom from the Legal Necessity of Perishing besides Christs satisfaction: If they should, the Scripture doth afford full and frequent Testimonies against them.

For the *Minor*, or Antecedent of the Major, 1. Understand, that I speak not of a deliverance from all necessity of perishing, even for their Sin against the Law: For there may be *necessitas Consequentiæ* which is but *necessitas Logica vel Conclusionis à præmissis Præscientia & Decreti Divini*, which may remain; *& necessitas ex rejectione remedii*, follow, 2. And I speak not of actual remission of Mens Sins against the Law, as if Christ had pardoned all. But I say, all Men are delivered from that necessity of Perishing, which the Tenour of the first Law (as standing alone *sine lege remediante*) did impose. If Men perish now it shall not be meerly, because they did not perfectly

fectly obey: Whether you respect *Adams* Sin imputed to them, or any Sin of their own considered meerly as against the Law of Works: Whether this liberation be by a proper Abrogation of the first Law (upon satisfaction undertaken) (as my Reverend Friend Mr. *G. Lawson* maintains in some Papers to me) or only by a Relaxation and Remission *Per Legem Remediantem*, *i. e.* an Act of Oblivion or Grace, (as I judg) the matter is of no great Moment, nor fit now to be debated: But that God condemneth no Man in the World, directly or meerly because he did not perfectly obey, and because the Law remains without remedy, which saith [obey perfectly and live] or [he that ever Sinneth shall dye] is plain from all that hath been said already, and from many other plain Texts of Scripture, 1. If Christ command his Gospel to be preached to all (every Creature in the World *viz.* Rational) that is, Pardon and Life to be offered them, then they remain not under that Legal necessity of perishing, (*viz.* because all that Sin must dye,) But the Antecedent is proved *ergo*, *&c.* 2. If God have given by his New Testament or Law, a conditional pardon to all, then they are not under that meer Rigorous Law *sine remedio*: But *&c*, *ergo*, *&c.* 3. It is impossible that Men should be under the precept of the Gospel, and the meer remedileſs rigor of the Law of Works both at once: But multitudes of Non-Elect are under the precept of the Gospel *Ergo*, *&c.* The *Minor* is undeniable: It is their duty to believe. The Major is as plain: For the remedileſs rigor of the Law, (I mean the terror of the Law as standing alone, without the Law of Grace

to

to remedy its obligation) saith, *Cursed is he that doth not all things*, &c. *Cursed is he that once Sinneth*: The Gospel saith, *Blessed is he that believeth though he hath Sinned a thousand times: Or, he that believeth though a Sinner, shall not dye, nor come into Condemnation*: And it commandeth Men to receive Christ as a Saviour, and so to believe that they may not perish. 4. Gods merciful dealing with the very Pagans shews that they are not under the meer rigor of the Law of Works: 1. The mercies themselves, 2. The use and end of them shews this, 1. It is not denied (by any that fear to deny God the acknowledgment of his mercies) but that wicked Men even Pagans, have many and great mercies from God. And its undeniable that all those mercies are inconsistent with the rigorous execution of the threatning of the first Law: And therefore that Law is not rigorously executed on them. And therefore it is relaxed to them. And God will not relaxe or dispense with his Law, but upon a valuable consideration, by which the ends of the Law may be attained. 2. And the end and use of these mercies (*viz.* the use that God requires them to make of them) is to lead Men to repentance, and to return to God from whom they are faln. And such mercies were never given according to the Covenant of Works, but only according to the Covenant of Grace, which is founded in Christs Blood. I do but touch on this because I think anon to speak of it more largely. 5. All Gods descriptions of Judgment in Scripture shew that no Men are under the meer Law of Works, as remedilesse. Men are not then examined meerly whether ever they Sinned, nor accused meerly

as Sinners: But the Question will be of that Sin in *Specie* which consisteth in refusing to repent or believe, or abusing that mercy which should have led them to repentance. *Mat.* 25. It is for not improving their Talents (which is not the legal reason, as the Law of Works is alone) or for not loving and cherishing Christ Jesus in his Members: It is for not knowing God, nor obeying the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is true that all their Sins also against the Law shall cause their condemnation; for they were never pardoned: But that is consequentially because they abused the Grace that should have recovered them; and so the Wrath of God abideth on them, that would not yield to his means for removing it. I no where read, that God will make this *Rigorous* Law alone, the *Norma Judicii*, and pass sentence on any meerly on these terms [If thou have never Sinned thou shalt be saved, else thou shalt be condemned] so that if we have no discovery what way or on what terms in special God will judg them that hear not of Christ; yet we have a plain discovery of the Negative, that he will not deal with them on the forementioned terms of the sole Covenant of Works: And consequently for the affirmative we are sure in general, that he deals with them upon terms of Grace, *i. e.* Mercy contrary to their desert More of this may be added anon.

Arg. 5. *Ab aquitate novæ Legis Credendi Debitum Constituentis.* The Faith which God requireth of Men to their Justification, hath not a feigned or deceiving object: But it should have such an object if Christ have not satisfied for all who are commanded

commanded to believe *ergo*, *&c.* Or thus; if Christ have not satisfied for all who are commanded to believe in him to Justification, then the Faith commanded them should have a feigned or deceiving object. But the Faith commanded them hath not a feigned or deceiving object *ergo*, *&c.*

All the proof requisite is of the consequence of the Major Proposition. And here we must first know what the justifying Act of Faith is, and then what the object must be, and then the consequence will manifest it self, Divines are not agreed what the justifying Act of Faith is, some think it must be but one Act, and therefore it must be placed but in one faculty: Of these some place it only in the understanding, as *Camero* and many others: Some only in the Will as *Amesius* and some few with him. Some and most place it in both faculties and so in divers Acts (and that rightly). And inded it hath divers Acts in each faculty: For as it is more then one particular Truth or exunciation which is the object of Assent, and therefore must have divers Acts of Assent; so it is in more then one shape and profitable respect that the Goodness of the object is presented to the Will, and therefore it must there have several Acts, as consent, affiance, *&c.* Now let us first enquire after the Acts of the understanding; where I will meddle with none but what is ordinarily by Divines asserted to be justifying or prerequisite thereto. And 1. I will let that pass which Dr. *Twisse* makes the first Act, *viz.* To believe Gods word to be true: For if it be not known what that word is here is no material object of Faith; but the formal object alone,

alone. 2. I will pass over the duty of repenting, which Dr. *Twiss* saith is next required (contrary to the usual Doctrine) though it is manifest that repentance it self as a means to remission, cannot be required but on supposition of satisfaction for Sin. The common answer to the *Arminians* [*Quicquid tenemur credere verum est*, &c.] Is, We are all bound to believe that Christ died for all that will believe in him. See what *Twiss* saith against this Answer in *Piscator Vindic. de promiss. lib.* 2. *Part* 2. *Sect.* 20. *Page* 475. (*Vol. Parv.*) 1. Men are not supposed first to be believers, and then Christ to dye for them; nor hath died at random without determining *in quorum Loco*, in whose stead, and left it to their Faith to determine afterwards. He hath not said, either, if thou believe I will die for thee? Or if thou believe, that Death which I have undergone shall be *tui loco*, in thy stead, or for thy Sins, Mans Sin being the *loco causæ meritoriæ* of Christs sufferings, it must be determined whose Sins he should suffer for before he suffer: For the meritorious cause is before the effect. And therefore Christ died for them, before they are believers; for else how did he procure them grace to believe. Not only *Davenant* hath well cleared this (in his dissert *de redempt*) but *Twiss* (*ubi supra P.* 474) could say, *Neque enim hujus propositionis veritas* [*Christus est Redemptor Noster*] *est veritas consequens fidem nostram: Nec ejus falsitas est falsitas consequens infidelitatem nostram sed antecedens: Antecedens inquam natura in genere causæ moralis, nempe meritoriæ; non autem in genere causæ Physicæ: Quod eo tantum addo, quoniam quod est prius natura in genere causæ Physicæ, impossibile est ut*

fit

sit posterius tempore, eo quo prius est natura: At quid est prius natura in genere causæ moralis & meritoriæ, præsertim ex libera Dei constitutione proficiscens, potest esse posterius tempore etiam eo quod est prius naturâ.

2. There must therefore be some former consideration of those for whom Christ died, Antecedent (*Moraliter*) to his Death: And that can be nothing, but for Sinners as such: It is therefore for all Sinners, or only for some. And the Doctrine of those that contradict me, is, that it was not indeterminately [for all that will believe] but determinately [to these particular Elect Persons, [that they may believe] for whom Christ satisfied. Now then according to this Doctrine, all Men where the Gospel is preached are bound to believe that Christ satisfied for the Elect to procure them Faith and consequently justification, that by so believing themselves may be justified: But, if they should so believe, this Faith would not justifie them for whom Christ Died not? so that here is a justifying Faith Commanded, without a justifying object; as I shall fullier shew anon. 2. And whereas Dr. *Twiss* saith, It is only the penitent that are commanded to believe on Christ for justification, I Answer 1. Then the Impenitent shall not be condemned for not believing in Christ for justification (which is false) for the omission is not so much as a Sin, much less damning, if faith be not commanded them. 2. It is nevertheless their duty, because other duties (as suppose repentance) are first to be performed. God may constitute many duties at once, though they are not to be performed at once but in order. 3. Repentance is a change of the Mind from Sin to God

and duty. To repent or to turn from unbelief, is the same thing with Faith. 4. If this repentance which he saith goes before Faith be sincere and saving, then sure it is not in an unbeliever and unjustified Man; if not; how comes it to give them a peculiar Right, and occasion their peculiar duty, of resting on Christ. 5. I shall shew anon that even repentance can be no duty (tending to pardon) if Christ hath not satisfied for them.

3. Others with great confidence say, that this is it that all are to believe [that there is no other name under Heaven whereby Men must be saved but only by the name of Christ made known in the Gospel] and Men perish for not believing the necessity of a Redeemer and that Jesus is the Redeemer [Or more fully] 1. Men are to repent and believe the Gospel to be the word of God to contain his Will, and that Jesus Christ therein revealed is the Wisdom and power of God to Salvation. 2. That there is an inseparable connexion between Faith and Salvation, by Gods appointment; Gospel faith carrying a Sinner quite out of himself and from off his own Righteousness. 3. That there be a particular conviction by the Spirit of the necessity of a Redeemer to their Souls in particular, whereby they become weary, heavy laden and burdened. 4. A serious full recumbency, and rolling of the Soul upon Christ in the promise of the Gospel as an al-sufficient Saviour, able to deliver and save to the utmost them that come to God by him; ready, able and willing through the preciousness of his Blood, and sufficiency of his Ransome to save every Soul, that shall freely give up

up themselves to him for that end, amongst whom he is resolved to be.] so Mr. *Owen Page.* 304. 305.

Sure it is, many Acts that are expressed in all these words. But 1. As I have said, every Man that hears the Gospel is obliged to all these; though to be performed in order, and not all at once. 2. A *Judas* may believe the necessity of a Redeemer. 3. And that Jesus is the Redeemer. 4. That there is no other, is an exclusion, which is necessary to the Faith which justifieth; but will not justify it self. 5. As to that of repentance, I have answered before. 6. The Devils believe that Christ is the Wisdom and Power of God to Salvation. No Man can believe that Christ hath Power to save him, that first believeth not that he hath satisfied for him. 7. The Devils may believe truly that there is an inseparable connexion between Faith and Salvation. But this is too general a Speech. It must be known in what respect and to what use Faith is so connexed to Salvation: And what Faith it is. No Faith is by God annexed to Salvation, but that which supposeth Christ to have satisfied for the believer. 8. *Judas* was convinced of the necessity of a Redeemer, and was weary and heavy laden. If it be special godly sorrow and hatred of Sin, that is meant, then such are justified already, and therefore were before obliged to believe to justification. 9. The recumbency mentioned is an Act of the Will of which we shall speak anon. 10. The promise is made to none that Christ died not for: For it is a promise of the benefits of his Death. 11. Christ is a sufficient Saviour, able and willing to save only those that

he died for. Supposing that he satisfied not for any Man, he is not sufficient or willing to save that Man though he should believe. How can it be said that by the sufficiency of his Ransome he is able to save them, for whom it is no Ransome? Indeed the sufficiency of Christs satisfaction is one principal object of that part of Faith which consisteth in Assent. But I shall shew anon, that if any Man be bound to believe Christs satisfaction sufficient to justifie him for whom it was never paid, he is bound to believe an untruth.

2. But the main answer given by Dr. *Twiss* and others, is, that the object of justifying Faith is not true, but good. It is Christ, whom they are bound to rest upon for Justification and Salvation. The truth is here are several Acts of the will requisite. The first is consent. Christ is offered to all where the Gospel is published, and it is their duty to consent to the Offer. Now if they should consent it would be an Act meerly frivolous, supposing Christ had not satisfied for them. For it is certain that he consents not to be the Head and Saviour of any such. And Mans consent without Christs, would do no good. They are commanded therefore (according to this Doctrine) to do that which if it were done would do no good.

2. The next Act is that Affiance, which some make the only justifying Act. Now according to this Doctrine this would be to many a vain Act: To rest upon Christ to save Men by his Blood which was never shed for them, is to rest on an insufficient Ground, which would deceive them. But (according to this Doctrine) Men

are

are bound to rest on Christ to save them by his Blood which was never shed for them. Therefore according to this Doctrine. Men are bound to rest on an insufficient Ground, which would deceive them.

Let none say, God knows they will not rest on Christ: For we are speaking now but of the Duty. God will never make it any Mans duty to rest for Salvation on that Blood that was never shed for him; or that satisfaction which was never made for him.

But because this reacheth but to those that have heard the Gospel, the next argument shall reach further.

Arg. 6th. *Ab æquitate legis cum sufficientia mediorum in suo genere.* If Christ hath not satisfied for all, then God hath appointed Men to use those means for their recovery and Salvation, which would do nothing to recover and save them if they were used. But God hath not appointed Men to use such vain and delusory means. *Ergo, &c.* Here I suppose that God hath appointed to all the World some means which they are to use for their recovery. I avoid the Remonstrants extream: I say not that all have sufficient means or Grace to believe, or to Salvation. And I avoid that fouler extream, which saith that Heathens are under the meer Law of works as it stands without remedy, and have no Means appointed them, or helps afforded them towards their recovery. I shall after prove that they have much mercy from Christs Blood: But now I am to prove that God hath not so left them remedileſs, but that he hath appointed to all Men some means of their

recovery. And 1. It is apparent they have much of the Light and Law of Nature: They have the Book of the Creatures wherein they may read much of God. 2. They have teaching providences, Mercies and Judgments. By these they may know that there is a God, and that he is the governor of the World, true, Just, Merciful, &c. That we owe him perfect obedience; that Sin deserves his wrath. By experience they may easily know that they are Sinners, and so liable to misery: By Gods Judgments, Sickness, Death, &c. they may know that God will punish: That the Soul is immortal, and punishments and rewards are specially in the Life to come, most *Pagans* do acknowledg. Gods abundant Mercies to them may acquaint them that he deals not with them in rigorous severity, and on terms of meer justice, but in mercy: And his not executing his Judgments on them according to desert, but shewing so much mercy to them, is some kind of pardoning them. Hence they may see that some way God hath for shewing mercy to the undeserving, and for pardoning Sinners, without any wrong to the Honour of his Justice, and Holiness, or to the ends of his Government. And hence they may see that they are not certainly helpless, and remediless nor their condition desperate Though they discover not the meritorious cause they may discern Gods mercy, the principal Efficient moving cause. Natural self-love bindeth Men in misery to seek out after remedy, and to discover what it is, and how they may attain it. All this the Heathens have manifested to us undeniably, in that all ages and Countries of them have confessed Gods being and Soveraignty, the

Duty

Duty of our obeying him, and that they were Sinners and deserved his Wrath, in this Life and that to come; especially for greater Sins; and that their condition was not hopeless, but Gods mercy had a way to help them; and therefore they plyed him with their Prayers and Sacrifices.

Arg. 1. If those that never heard of Christ are bound to take their case for desperate, then they are bound to believe an untruth; (for Christ may be discovered to them, and they saved.) But, *&c. Ergo*, &c.

2. If they are bound to judge their case remediless, then they are bound to contradict the experience of Gods merciful dealing with them; (which are an actual remedy to part of their misery and may give them hope of more from the same cause, if they will seek it.) But, *&c. Ergo*, &c,

3. If they are bound to judge their case remediless, or not to judge that there is some remedy; then they should not be bound to use any means, (Praying, Repenting, sending abroad to enquire after the Remedy in more knowing Countries, *&c.*) for the attaining Remedy. But the consequent is false. *Ergo*, &c.

If a Star appearing brought the wise men so far to seek Christ, and if men will travail all over the World for Riches by way of Merchandize; How diligently should men that find themselves miserable, enquire far and near for a remedy? And if it were not their duty to use means for recovery, then it is not their Sin that they do not use them. But he that dare tell them so,

let him, for I dare not; but the contrary I dare tell them.

4. If all such men are not bound to judge their case remediable, and cureable, but hopeless; then God should lose all that common honour and service that he hath from them, and the World would be as Hell, full of nothing but hatred of God, and blaspheming him, and sinning to the utmost without any self-restraint. For he that hath no hope, will use no means, nor forbear any evil, but hate God as his Enemy.

5. The *Ninevites* discerned a remedy and some hope, and Repentance and Humiliation was Gods means, by which they were actually recovered, I am sure, from under some of Gods wrath, which else would have broke out on them; whether from eternal wrath, I know not; but its most probable; *For they believed God*, Jonah 3.5. *and Repented*, Mat. 12.41. Luke 11. 32. Yet there is no intimation that *Jonah* Preached Christ to them, or that they ever heard of him. Men therefore that hear not of Christ are bound to use means for remedy. And indeed the satisfaction of Christ is of greater necessity to mans Salvation, than our knowledge of Christ, or Faith in him: God can save them that never knew Christ, if he will, (witness the case of Infants; and else there were but few saved before Christs coming) but morally we may say, he cannot save them without Christs satisfaction for their Sin.

6. *Acts* 17. 27. It is the duty of all *Pagans To seek the Lord, if happly they might feel after him and find him.* And doubtless this is to seek the recovery

very of his favour, and not to seek it in despair, as the Devils.

7. *Acts* 14. 17. Gods giving rain and fruitful seasons, and filling mens hearts with food and gladness, and doing them good, is his witness among them. And sure it witnesseth his mercy to them, and consequently their duty.

8. *Rom.* 2. 4. The Holy Ghost expressly telleth us that men should know that the forbearance, long-suffering and goodness of God leadeth to Repentance; that is, is a help thereto, and manifesteth it to be their duty to Repent: And doubtless this Repentance is not a hellish despairing Repentance; (for Judgments are fitter to move to that than Mercy,) but a Repentance which is to be used as a means to recovery.

9. It is the description of wicked men, that they seek not after God, *Rom.* 3. 11. *Psal.* 14. 2 God looks to see if there be any that seeks him.

10. Many Texts in the Prophets shew it to be all mens duty to seek the Lord, in order to their finding mercy; (and to deny it, is to turn out the remnants of obedience, or all seeds of Religion from the World:) And that God calls them all to Repentance, and to that end that they may not Die, but escape his wrath and be recovered. And that he hath sworn *That he hath no pleasure in the Death of him that Dieth, but rather that he Repent and Live.* So that I think it is clear that God appointed even to those that hear not the Gospel, certain means toward their Recovery: Much more evident is it of all those where the Gospel is preached.

I say

I say not that he commandeth all the former, or any directly to believe in Christ; but it must be understood, that all men are many degrees distant from Christ, before he draweth them effectually to himself. Now the Pagans are more degrees from him than professed Christians (mostly:) It is not Christs way to bring men to himself *per saltum*, but by those Degrees of Recovery, which are the particular cure of their degrees of distance. One wicked man knows of Christ and doth half entertain him, but sticks at some pleasing Sin. Another knows not that he is miserable by sin, nor ever considered how to be recovered, nor ever prayed God to shew him a way to escape his wrath, nor ever heard of Christ: This latter must receive much of Christs mercy before he be brought so near to Christ as the former. Christ loved one wicked man as not being far from the Kingdom of God; and some with *Agrippa*, are almost perswaded to be Christians. Those that be not come so far must (ordinarily) by degrees be brought to this, before they can go further. If you be in a higher room, and call your Servants to you, you intend they shall come up the stairs step by step; and if one be two stories distant from you, and another but one, the former must go up all the first stairs before he come as near you as the latter is. The *Gentiles* that believed not, are further off, and more strangers to God than the common *Jews* were. Now God hath not given them that hear not of Christ sufficient means or help to Believe (nor hath he given any believer sufficient Grace for Salvation, till he saveth him.) But he prescribeth some means to all men in the World which

which they are to use, to bring them nearer Christ and Faith, and to remove impediments: As to consider of what the Book of Nature and daily providences teach them of God: To study him in his mercies and Judgments. To study their own hearts till they find their Sin and misery: To use all their interest and utmost endeavours to enquire what remedy God hath revealed to the World: To continue in Prayer, fasting and Alms deeds as *Cornelius* did, and to break off their Sins by repentance. These are their duties: And for not doing these, in the improvement of their Talents, they shall be condemned by Christ the Redeemer at the Bar of grace, (as opposed to that of Justice according to the sole Law of works.) And (though that belong not to this controversie) I doubt not but they have sufficient help which is not effectual to the doing of more in these means then they do; and so they will be left unexcusable at Judgment. Even as the Ignorant and ungodly where the Gospel is preached, have sufficient power (which is not effectual through their own wilfulness) to hear the word, to come into better company and to use more means to get Faith then they do, though they have not power or grace sufficient to believe. And the duty of hearing, *&c.* Goes in order before that of believing.

All this being thus evinced (That God hath prescribed to all Men, means of recovery) I come to the Argument. And for the *Minor* I think I need not stand to prove it (That God hath not appointed Men delusory means, which if used according to his appointment would not do any thing towards the attainment of the end)

so

so apparently is such a conceit injurious to the Wisdom, goodness and faithfulness of God.

And for the Major it seems to me as plain, (That no means can do any thing to the recovery or Salvation of that Man, for whom Christ made not satisfaction by his Death) Supposing this means were used never so rightly.) For 1. The use of all means is but to apply or convey the benefits of Christs Satisfaction. Therefore where Christ hath made no satisfaction for a Man, there it is impossible that any means should give him to participate of the benefits of his satisfaction: At least of Pardon and Salvation. 2. Else you make a Saviour of the means, or make them more necessary then Christs Satisfaction: For if by means that Man may be saved that Christ dyed not for, then he is saved without Christs Death. And if God might do so by all the Non Elect, why not by all the rest.

If any say, It is certain that they will not use the means rightly and therefore will not be saved; I answer 1. This shall be anon further considered 2. That is nothing to the matter. The question is, Why these Men are not saved? Whether it be not for want of a right use of the means? But according to the Doctrin opposed, it is not: For no means could save them, if they were never so well used. 1. No Prayer can be heard if satisfaction be not first made for the Sins of the Petitioner. 2. Repentance can be no means, but only a Concomitant of desperation if satisfaction for Sin go not before it. 3. Faith is but resting for Salvation on one that never redeemed the Person, and so cannot save him, if satisfaction for that Person go not before it.

4. Hope

4. Hope would be wholly ungrounded, and deceitful like the hopes of the wicked, if there were no satisfaction. 5. Love to Christ as our Redeemer, and gratitude for satisfaction, would be a mistaken Act, as being for a mercy never received. 6. Nay should the Non-redeemed live as holily as any Saint on Earth, yea as innocently as an Angel, it would not save him; because of the guilt which he hath already contracted. So that by this Doctrin all the means which God hath appointed most Men for their pardon and Salvation, would be delusory and vain if never so well performed: Which is not true, nor tollerable.

Arg. 7th. *A veritate promissionis, & fidei conditionalitate.*

If Christ satisfied not for all those to whom God promiseth pardon and Life on condition of believing, then God maketh promises which he would not, nor could he fulfill though the condition were performed. But the consequent is false: Therefore so is the Antecedent.

There is nothing here requires any proof but the consequence of the Major proposition: And that is proved thus. God would not nor could give pardon and Life to any Man for whom Christ hath not satisfied. Therefore the consequence is good. 1. Else God should give pardon and Life without a Redeemer: Which he will not. 2. And he should do that which in the Judgment of most Divines he cannot do: (Not through impotence, but because of the inconvenience and unfitness of the thing:) For though he can alter

ter the nature of the Creatures, and so make that to be fit which now is unfit, yet *stante rerum natura* he cannot make those things fit, which *ex natura rei* are unfit: Nor can God do that which is unfit. And if it had not been unfit for the supream Rector of the World to pardon Mans Sin without satisfaction, God would not so dearly have satisfied his own justice. Yea all say, that *quoad potentiam ordinatam*, God would not forgive Sin without satisfaction, whatsoever he might have done *quoad potentiam absolutam*. Now how gross is it, for any Man to imagine, that God should make so solemn a promise, in form of a Law of Grace, that he will pardon and save Men if they will believe, when if they could and should believe, he neither would nor could pardon or save them, for want of satisfaction to his Justice! Yea that he should require his Ministers so importunately, and unweariedly to intreat Men in his name to believe and be reconciled to him, and to tell them from him Man by Man [If thou wilt believe thou shalt be saved] When yet if he did believe he should not be saved.

Object. *But if he should believe then he is one that Christ satisfied for; and therefore should be saved.*

Answ. The Persons are determined of long ago for whom Christ satisfied. Either he hath satisfied for me or he hath not, before my Faith. If he have not, then my Faith will not cause him to satisfie for me, either by suffering again, or by

by making that satisfaction to have been paid for me, which was not.

Object. *But it is a thing that never will be, for one to believe for whom Christ did not satisfie: And therefore it is a thing not to be supposed.*

Ans. 1. Things may and must be supposed in dispute that never will be. That the Elect should have the desert of their Sin, or be unredeemed, or be forsaken of God, or deprived of any mercy which God will give them, are all things that never will be: And yet a Christian may argue on supposition they had been or should be, to raise his thankfulness: What if God should have denied me his Grace? Or his Redemption? Or let me perish in my Sin, and State of nature? What a Case would my Sin have brought me under.

2. If it be a thing not to be supposed in dispute, that a Man should believe for whom Christ satisfied not, then it is because it implieth a contradiction. (Else it may be supposed.) But it implieth no contradiction, *Ergo, &c.*

Object. *It is a contradiction: Because Christ purchased Faith for all those for whom he satisfied; and therefore for a Man to believe for whom Christ purchased not Faith is a contradiction.*

Ans. 1. I shall take it as a groundless fancy till it be proved, that Christ purchased Faith to be eventually certainly given to all those for whom he satisfied. 2. If he had, this argument

is

is not from ſatisfaction as ſuch, but as it is meritorious of Faith. 3. ſtill it is no contradiction, becauſe it implyeth no contradiction for a man to believe without that Grace which Chriſt hath purchaſed; though it be a thing that will never be done. 4. They that will ſtill affirm the contrary do the more deſtroy their own Cauſe. For they then aſſert, that all Gods commands by his Laws and Miniſters, to the unredeemed, (as they ſuppoſe them) for believing in Chriſt, do require meer impoſſibilities, and ſuch contradictions as are not to be ſo much as ſuppoſed in diſpute, which I think few ſober men will grant; but rather avoid that opinion that is the ground of ſuch an aſſertion. 5. And (which is more) the ſame abſurdity will follow, as to all other means whatſoever, (as well as Faith) which God hath preſcribed to ſuch men for pardon and ſalvation; (as they are means) and ſo bring this reproach on the whole New Law, as made to all ſuch Men.

Object. *But the ſame may be ſaid againſt Gods Foreknowledge or Decree. For if God Fore-know or Decree that men ſhall certainly periſh, then it may as well be ſaid, that though they ſhould believe, God neither would nor could ſave them.*

Anſw. 1. As to the Power of God, it is not ſtraitened by his Decree. It follows not [God will not do ſuch a thing, therefore he cannot,] The ſame Divines whom I now argue againſt, uſe to argue thus about Phyſical Predetermination [Gods Determination of his own will, deſtroyeth not his Power or liberty to the contrary acts;

act; therefore his determination of our wills, destroyeth not our Power or Liberty to the contrary acts] whereby they grant that God can save those that he decreeth not to save; and so can give them Faith. *&c.* and that he is still free to do it or not do it.

Object. *If he should believe and be saved, whom God hath foreknow nor decreed to be condemned for Unbelief, then God should be deceived or change. But it is impossible for God to be deceived or change; therefore it is impossible for him to believe and be saved whom God hath foreknown or decreed to condemn for unbelief.*

Answ. It is a vicious Argumenr. There's more in the conclusion than in the premises. No more will follow but this, [therefore he will not believe and be saved whom God, *&c.*] not [it is impossible] for God never foreknew or decreed that it should be impossible for him to believe and be saved, but only that he *would not* eventually believe and be saved.

2. When I speak (before in the Argument) of Gods will, it is not of his will of Decree, but of his will as he is in the relation of *Rector per Leges* and so giveth that Salvation as executor of his Laws and Sentence, which by his Laws he first gave Right to. God as Rector and Legislator neither will nor can give Salvation to any that Christ dyed not for, if they should believe: But God as Legislator or Rector would give salvation to all that Christ Dyed for if they believe, though it were supposed that he had foreknown or decreed that such men would not believe. Only

ly it would follow that God was mistaken. And therefore such a thing will never come to pass; for God will not be mistaken. It is God to Legislator to whom it belongs to be true, in making good his promises, which is the thing in Question.

5. The want of an expiatory sacrifice doth morally necessitate the Damnation of Man, though he should believe both in respect of the Law of works (as Christs Death is *Causa necessaria liberationis*; as want of a Ransome may be said to necessitate a Captives perishing) and properly in respect to the new Law, whose Penalty is, 1. Non-liberation. 2. And a surer punishment. For the chief cause of that Non-liberation or Non-salvation must needs be the defect of that which should be the chief cause of Deliverance and Salvation rather than the defect of (Faith) a subservient cause or condition which ever supposeth the former cause. If two men at Christs bar be impleaded as lyable to Damnation; and it be said to one [Thou hast no Right to Salvation for Christ never Dyed for thee] and to the other, [thou hast no right, because thou didst not believe; is not the former more valid, then the latter; or as valid: But to say, [Thou hast no right because God did decree the contrary is not right arguing. 4. We must not argue *a minus notis*, as the Decrees are, as shall be shewed.

Arg. 8th. *A Causa pereundi negativè.*

If Christ hath not satisfied for all men, then the cause of mens perishing is for want of an expiatory

satory Sacrifice. But the want of an expiatory Sacrifice is not the cause of men perishing, there are Christ hath satisfied for all. By [the cause] I mean not the meritorious cause, (for that no doubt must be some sin of Man.) And I suppose that Unbelievers are not condemned according to the first Law of works, as standing without Remedy, that is, not meerly because they did not perfectly obey; but at the Redeemers bar, because they believed not, and would not have Christ to Reign over them, or because they improved not their Talents of Grace, (that is, of mercy given contrary to desert.) And of those that hear the Gospel, this is undenyable; (and I think it is certainly true of all others.) So that it is perishing in reference to a Gospel Judgment at the Mediators Bar that we mean; and specially in a comparative sence: And by [cause] I mean, the Reason of their perishing to be alledged: So that if you ask, seeing all are equally condemned by the Law of works, and mercy hath found out a Remedy, what is the reason that this man is condemned at the Redeemers Bar, when that is acquit? Or that this Man (*Judas*) is not delivered and saved as well as that (*Peter?*) Is it because Christ Dyed only for one, or that one only believed and the other refused Christ? Here according to the Doctrine which denyeth Universal Satisfaction, it must be said that either the only or the principal reason that men perish when others are saved, is for want of an expiatory sacrifice, or satisfaction for their Sin; *i. e.* because they had no Redeemer when others had, or no Christ to Die for them.

But this is contrary to the Scripture. The consequence is evident, that it is more principally, the want of a Saviour or satisfaction then the want of Faith that is the reason of their perishing, if Christ satisfied not for them. 1. Because satisfaction is prerequisite to the efficacy or usefulness of Faith: *Sed non è contra.* 2. Satisfaction hath the greatest work to do, and is the greatest cause: And faith hath a far and a lower work; and is a lesser cause, or indeed no cause at all, but a meer condition. 3. God could not fitly save Sinners without satisfaction: But he could, if he had pleased, have saved them for that satisfaction, without a personal Faith as he doth Infants, and as he saved the Church before Christs Incarnation, without that Faith which now justifieth, *viz.* Believing that this Jesus is the Christ; and without believing in any Articles of our Creed. If two Men be mortally sick, and one be healed, and the other not, because one had a costly Cordial, and the other had none prepared for him, but only a nonimal offer without the thing; though this Man refuse that nominal or feigned offer, yet the chief cause why he was not healed was the want of the medicament, rather then his refusal.

And for the *Minor*, its plain through the whole New Testament that the cause of Mens perishing is not for want of an expiatory Sacrifice, but for want of Faith to receive the Redeemer and his benefits, *Mat.* 23. 37. *How oft would I have gathered thee, &c. ye would not,* Isa. 5. 4. *What could have been done more to my Vineyard, &c.* Mat. 24. 4. 5. *Tell them which are bidden, behold I have prepared my dinner. My Oxen and Fatlings are killed and all things are ready*

Come

Come unto the Marriage. But they made light of it, &c. verse 8. *The Wedding is ready, but they which were bidden were not worthy, i. e.* There is no want on Christs Part, his Sacrifice and satisfaction is sufficient: But they lost the benefits for want of believing, *Mat.* 25. 1. 2. All the Virgins might have been accepted at the Marriage, if their own sloath had not shut out the foolish, *verse* 14. All the Servants had Talents (mercies purchased by Christs Death) but it was, not well using them that condemned one. Men treade under Foot the Blood of the Covenant wherewith they were sanctified: And deny the Lord that bought them, Mens destruction is of themselves. But in God (through Christ) is their help. All the Scripture shews this, that Men perish for their rejecting a Redeemer and not for want of the Price of Redemption: For *quoad pretium*, Christ hath taken away the Sins of the World.

Arg. 9th. A *Sufficientiâ pretii pro omnibus.*

If Christ died for all Men *quoad sufficientiam pretii*, then he hath satisfied for all. But he died for all Men *quoad sufficientiam pretii Ergo, &c.* The *Minor* is maintained by the generality of our Ancienter Protestant Divines, who use ordinarily this distinction to solve the doubt, whether Christ died for all? *viz.* he died for all sufficiently, and for the Elect only effectually. And indeed this one distinction rightly understood, and this answer thence fitted, is most full and apt for the resolution of the question. The Schoolmen go the same way.

The consequence of the Major proposition is acknowledged by our late most rigid *Anti-Arminians*, who on that reason do deny the *Minor*. For our new Divines have utterly forsaken the old common opinion, and in stead of saying that [Christ died for all Men *sufficienter*] They will not so much as say that [His Death was *sufficiens pretium pro omnibus*] But only that [It is sufficient to have been a price for all.] For all our former Divines (and the most of these times; so far as I can discern) who acknowledg that Christ died for all Men *quoad sufficientiam pretii*, and for the Elect *quoad efficaciam*; they say the same, and as much as I; and therefore I need not say much more to them. For Christ cannot dye for Men *sufficienter* and yet not die for them at all, or not satisfie for them. I may well take up with this one argument. If Christs Death be a *sufficient price* for all, then it is a *Price* for all: But Christs Death is (by their confession) a *sufficient* Price for all: Therefore it is a Price for all. Here understand that it is first in order of nature a Sacrifice expiatory, or a satisfaction, before it is meritorious of further benefits, or is a Price for them. Had it not been to satisfie Justice, God would have been so far from taking his Sons Death for meritorious, that he would have been utterly displeased in it: For he delighteth not in the Death of him that dieth; how much less of the innocent; and lest of all of his only Son.

Note here also in what sence we say, Christs Death is sufficient, and in what sence it is called effectual: There is a double effect of Christs Death, and so a double efficacy, and so a double sufficiency to those effects; The first effect is to be

be a satisfaction to the offended Justice of God, and a demonstration of his legal Justice. The sufficiency to this effect was in the dignity of the Person, and greatness of the suffering, supposing Gods voluntary Acceptation of it, instead of the Sinners own suffering. The efficacy immediately followed the suffering: Yea it went long before it, upon the undertaking and the acceptation as in Moral Causes it is not unusual. The 2d. sort of effects, are more remote, even the actual good of the Sinner: Of these some are general and common, (as the freeing of all Men from that necessity of perishing, which lay on them by the Curse of the first Law as it stood without remedy, &c.) And so Christs Death is sufficient for all and effectual too. Some fruits of his Death are special and follow the performance of the condition imposed on us (Faith and Repentance) such are Pardon, Justification, Adoption, Sanctification, Glorification. These being the main effects of Christs Death which Scripture most frequently mentioneth, and to which the rest are but general preparatives, therefore our Divines use to call these peculiarly [Redemption] and [the Effects of Christ Death] and they say his Death is effectual, when these effects are produced. And so I conclude that as to the first effect of satisfaction to God, Christs Death is both sufficient and effectual for all: Or else he could not be said to die for all, *quoad sufficienciam pretii*. For it is impossible that Christ should intend it as a Price, and make it a sufficient Price, and yet that God should not accept it as such: Seeing Christ is God; and the will of the Father and the Son is one. And the like I

say of the General Common benefits. And as for the great particular special benefits of Pardon and Sanctification and Glory. I say Christs Death is sufficient for all; but effectual only for the Elect. And this must needs be the meaning of our forementioned Divines. For the sufficiency to Justification and Salvation, containeth the efficacy and effect in point of satisfaction.

But our new more rigid Divines will make me more work: And therefore to them I must forme my Argument otherwise, or else they will say, I beg the question: With them therefore I argue thus.

If Christs Death be sufficient for all, then Christ satisfied for all: But Christs Death is sufficient for all: *Ergo, &c.*

In these terms they use to acknowledg the *Minor* proposition themselves. And as to the several effects, 1. They frequently say that Christs Death is sufficient for the Pardon and Salvation of all Men in the World, if they will believe. Where the Words [if they will believe] must needs be referred to the effect [Pardon and Salvation] and not to [sufficient:] For Mans belief addeth not to the sufficiency of Christs Death. Nor will Faith make it sufficient, if it were not so before. The sufficiency goes before Faith: But that which is sufficient to justifie men, shall not actually do it till Men believe 2. They say, that Christs Death is sufficient *ut effect pretium pro omnibus*, to have been a Price for all. But then they say, that it is not *sufficiens pretium* a sufficient price for all, because no price for all. Now I shall prove that both their concessions do warrant my consequence; and, 1. That If Christs Death be sufficient for the Pardon of all, if they would believe;

lieve, then he hath satisfied for all; and it was all Mens Sins that procured his punishment, and which he bore on the Cross: Or that Christs Death is insufficient to the Pardon of any one for whom he hath not satisfied. 1. That which hath not satisfied offended Majesty, is not sufficient to the pardon of Mans Sin though he should believe. But Christs Death (As these Men say) Hath not satisfied the offended Majestie: Therefore it is not sufficient, &c. He that denieth the consequence must hold, that Sin may be pardoned without Christs satisfaction 2. That which leaveth the great impediment of Mens Remission unremoved, and not removeable by Faith, is not sufficient to the Pardon of Men, though they should believe. But Christs Death, if it be not suffered for Men, ot have not satisfied for their Sin, doth leave the great impediment of remission unremoved, and not removable by Faith: Therefore it is not sufficient to the pardon of these Men though they should believe.

The impediment I mean, is in a word all that which did necessitate or require satisfaction: That Faith, cannot satisfie God instead of Christs Death, is undeniable: Nor yet can it make that satisfaction or be mine that was never made for me. There is neither in the nature of Faith, nor in the Office which God hath appointed it, any sufficiency to be instead of a Redeemer, or satisfaction. And therefore it is not merely nor chiefly for want of faith that such would perish, but through the insufficiency of Christs Death. If they shall still say, that it is not to be supposed that the Nonredeemed should believe: I Answer: Do not they suppose it themselves when they say that,

the

the Death of Christ is sufficient for the Pardon and Salvation of all Men, if they would believe.

3. That which leaveth the strongest Faith (supposing it were) both without ground, and use or profit. is not sufficienr to remission or Salvation, though Men should believe: But so doth Christs Death, if it be not suffered for Men, and have not satisfied for them: *Ergo, &c.* 1. If all the Faith in Christ that is in all Men in the World were confined to one Man, it would not do the least good to his Justification or Salvation, if Christ have not satisfied for him as is already proved. 2. Nay indeed such a Faith would be but an ungrounded fancy or presumption. To expect pardon from a satisfaction that was never made for me. is a vain expectation.

4. If Christs Death have no more conducibility, or virtue for any Mens remission and Salvation, then if he had never died at all; then it is not sufficient to Pardon those Men if they will believe. But if Christ hath not satisfied for Men, his Death hath no more conducibility or vertue for the Remission of those Mens Sins, or for their Salvation then if he had never died at all: Therefore his Death is not sufficient to the Pardon or Salvation of those Men, though they should believe.

The Major is clear: The *Minor* is proved, in that satisfaction is the first and great effect of Christs Death, and where that is not made, there is nothing done by it that can any way Conduce to the Remission of Sin: And if that satisfaction be not already made, it never will be; for there is no more Sacrifice for Sin. So that methinks I may confidently conclude, that they deny the Sufficiency

ency of Christs Death for the Pardon of all Mens Sins though they should believe, who say, he did not suffer and satisfie for all.

And that this is unsound Doctrine I will now prove only by their Judgments who are the owners of it: 1. Mr. *Owen* of Redemption *Lib.* 4. *c.* 1. *Page* 173. saith, [The maintaining and declaring of this (dignity, worth, preciousness and infinite value of the Blood and Death of Jesus Christ) is doubtless especially to be considered: And every opinion that doth but seemingly clash against it, is exceedingly prejudiced, at least deservedly suspected; yea presently to be rejected by Christians, if upon search it be found so do so really and indeed, as that which is injurious and Derogatory to the merit and honour of Jesus Christ. The Scripture also to this purpose is exceeding full and frequent in setting forth the Excellency and Dignity of his Death and Sacrifice, *&c.*] And *Page* 174. [But its true worth consists in the immediate effects products and Issues of it, with what in its own nature it is fit and able to do,] Is it not therefore strange that this Author should (*Page* 175. 176) say, [1. That this fulness and sufficiency of the merit of the Death of Christ, is a foundation for the general publishing of the Gospel to all Nations, with the right that it hath to be preached to every creature; because the way of Salvation which it declares is wide enough for all to walk in: There is enough in the remedy it brings to light to heal all their diseases, to deliver them from all their evils, If there were 1000 Worlds the Gospel of Christ might on this ground be Preached to them all, there being enough in Christ

Christ for the Salvation of them all, if so be they will derive vertue from him by touching him by Faith; the only way to draw [refreshment from this Fountain of Salvation] [2. That the Teachers of the Gospel in their particular Congregations, &c. may from hence justifiably call upon every Man to believe, with assurance of Salvation to every Man in particular upon his doing, knowing and being fully perswaded of this, that there is enough in the death of Christ to save every one that shall so do.] To all which I briefly reply 1. I have disproved this in what is said before; and shewed that Christs death cannot be affirmed sufficient for any Mans Salvation, for whom it never satisfied, though he should believe 2. How can he say [there is sufficient merit] where there is no merit at all. The Death of Christ hath no merit as to the Pardon of Devils, or any for whom it was never suffered. 3. How can he call any thing [a way of Salvation wide enough] which presupposeth not Christs satisfaction for the person? Can Men walk to Heaven by Faith without a Redeemer? Or is there such a true Faith? 4. How can he truely say [there is enough in the remedy] Which is as to them no Remedy? Is there enough in that remedy to heal the Devils if they believed? 5. How can there be enough in it, or how can it be any remedy, to heal all diseases, and deliver from all evils, before it have made satisfaction? Must it not do that before it can heal any other disease? 6. How can he say, [There is enough in Christ for the Salvation of them all, if so be they will derive virtue from him by touching him by Faith?] Must not the appli-

application be first to God by satisfying him before it can be made to Man by believing? Is not the Salvation of Men the Fruit of Christs dying for them? And can there be the effect without the cause? Hath Christ virtue to be derived for the saving of any that he died not for? Will believing make Christ to die for them that he hath not died for already. 7. In plain truth your ground of preaching Christ to all, is your foreknowledge that only the Elect will believe, and not the sufficiency of Christs Death, knowing that there is nothing in Christs Death to save any man that he did not Die and Satisfie for, though he should believe never so strongly.

2. But let us come to the first effect of Christs Death, and see whether it were sufficient to that, *viz.* to be a satisfaction for the Sins of all: And here they do maintain that it is only materially or aptitudinally sufficient, (as the money which my rich neighbour hath in his purse, is sufficient to pay my debt, which he resolveth never to pay: Or as the Ransome paid for one man, was enough to have redeemed another also, if it had been paid for him.) And what the better is he for whom it was never paid? And what difference (as to their ransome) between most men, and Devils? For the form of a satisfaction or Price for all, they affirm, that Christs Death hath it not sufficiently or at all. These men must once more therefore new moddel their Doctrine, or reform their expressions, and give over saying that [Christs death is sufficient for the pardon of all if they would believe,] for that is notoriously false (according to them;) seeing the effecting of satisfaction, is that wherein the sufficiency of

of it lyes as to remission: But they must hereafter say only that [Christs Death was sufficient to have procured pardon for all men, if he would have suffered it for all.] And I will give them this encouragement so far to innovate, *viz.* Though they speak not only against Scripture and the Primitive Fathers, and the Church of Christ in all Ages, and the generallity of our most severe Protestant Divines; yet because, 1. It is against *Arminius*, an adversary: 2. And tendeth to extreams. 3. And so is agreeable to Nature; they shall perhaps with applause, at least with far less wounding of their Reputation, raise up these novelties, than a Sober, Moderate, Judicious Divine shall beat them down again, or revive any one Truth which extreams have clouded, laid by and trodden under foot.

But I will not stay here to shew the absurdity of mens so confident asserting Christs death to be aptitudinally sufficient for so many for whom it was never suffered, seeing I shall deal on this purposely in the next Argument: But how useless this sufficiency is, and no foundation at all for our general offer of Christ and mercy to all if they will believe, may be seen in what is said before. And how useless and insufficient it is to encourage any man to believe, we shall yet further have occasion to shew anon. In the mean time, I think the unsoundness of their Doctrine, who deny Universal Satisfaction is manifest hence, in that it fully overthrows the sufficiency of Christs Death for the pardon of all mens sins if they should believe, which yet the generality of our Divines do maintain.

Arg. 10th. *Ab abſurdo: & injuriâ contrariâ Doctrinæ in Chriſtum.*

If Chriſt have paid a Price of ſatisfaction, ſufficient for the ſins of all the World, and yet paid it not for all the World, then he ſuffered much in vain. But he ſuffered not any thing in vain. *Ergo*, &c.

The *Minor*, none will deny that is a Chriſtian.

The conſequence of the *Major* is proved *ad hominem* by the conceſſions of them of the contrary Opinion.

For, 1. No Reformed Divine doth deny but that as one part of the value of Chriſts ſufferings was from the Dignity of the perſon, ſo the other (and a neceſſary part) was from the greatneſs of his ſufferings.

2. And all conclude that there was more ſuffering neceſſary for the expiation of the ſins of all the World than for one particular ſin, or then for one mans ſins; and ſo more neceſſary to expiate the ſins of all men, then of the few only that are choſen: And conſequently, if Chriſt ſuffered no more than was ſufficient for the Redemption of the Elect, then it was not ſufficient for the Redemption of all. And if it were ſufficient for the Redemption of all (materially) then it was more than was ſufficient for the Redemption of the Elect. Our Divines generally diſclaim and exclaim againſt that preſumptuous fancy of the Fryers that ſay, *Minima guttula ſanguinis Chriſti ſufficeret ad redimendos mille mundos. Vid.* Parker *de Deſcenſ.* l. 3. p. 107, 108. And I meet yet with few that like

John

John Geodwins conceit, of the ſufficiency of Chriſts meer willingneſs and readineſs to ſuffer, without any actual ſuffering. They that ſay, the ſame degree of ſuffering is ſufficient for a thouſand men as for one may, as well ſay next, that one ſigh or groan, or one drop of Chriſts Blood had been ſufficient for all: And next they may as well ſay, it had been ſufficient though he had only been willing to ſuffer; and next, that his ſuffering was needleſs. *Socinianiſm*, if not Infidelity, may eaſily creep in at this Gap.

3. And as thus it is evident that Chriſts ſuffering for ſome, had been enough to have redeemed all, doth make him to ſuffer in vain as to the proper end of his ſuffering (*viz.* Expiation of Sin) ſo they that go this way, have not yet ſhewed us, to what other end or uſe, ſuch great ſufferings of Chriſt were neceſſary: And till they have done that we muſt take it as if they charged Chriſt with ſuffering in vain.

4. Moreover, the conſequence is fully granted by themſelves. For they accuſe thoſe that maintain Univerſal Satisfaction, as making Chriſt to ſuffer in vain, if he ſuffered for thoſe that after periſh (though we can eaſily repel that vain objection by ſhewing them many excellent ends and effects of thoſe his ſufferings.) How much more evidently do they themſelves make him ſuffer in vain, that feign him to have ſuffered the ſame degree of Puniſhment, even enough for all the World; when yet (they ſay) he ſuffered it not ſo much as in the ſtead of all, nor as any ſatisfaction for their ſins. We ſay his Death was for all, in ſome kind, and therefore not vain. They ſay, it was for them in no kind, and yet enough for

for them; and therefore he suffered Superfluously.

Arg. 11th. *Ab absurdo, & injuriâ contra Justitiam Divinam.*

If Christ suffered enough for to have been a satisfaction for all, and yet not for all, then God did inflict on him more sufferings than were due to him. But God did not inflict on Christ more sufferings than were due, *Ergo*, &c.

He that denyeth the *Minor* doth directly accuse God of injustice.

The consequence of the *Major* is proved thus: He that inflicteth that, or requireth as much for the Sins of the Elect only as is due for the sins of all the World, doth inflict and require more than is due (for there is not so much due for the sins of the Elect only as for the sins of all the World) But thus they suppose God to have done, (which is not to be supposed,) *Ergo*, &c. They that will fly from the force of these Arguments by flat denying even the Material and Hypothetical sufficiency of Christs satisfaction for all men, will fall under many and great inconveniencies before intimated and also under the force of this next Argument. (Read my Answer to their Fourth Argument asserted.

Arg. 12th. *Ab injuriosâ negatione Passionum Christi.*

It is very injurious to Christ for men to extenuate or deny his sufferings, but so do they

that deny that he hath satisfied for all men. *Ergo*, &c.

When God hath laid upon him the Iniquity of us all, and he hath born the sins of the whole World, and was a Propitiation for them, doth not that man vilifie (that I say not blaspheme) his sufferings, who shall say it is not so; he bore the Sins but of the few that are chosen; he suffered no more than was due to them; he paid no more than would discharge their Debt. If he that denyeth all Christs satisfaction, do sin so damnably, then sure he that denyeth the greatest part both of his satisfaction formally, and his suffering materially, doth not lightly offend. If he should sin so hainously that should deny God to be Creator of the greater part of the World, and so rob him of the honour of the most of his Workmanship, then it cannot be a trifle to deny the greatest part of Christs sufferings and satisfaction, and so rob him of so much of the honour of the work of Redemption, by the extenuation of his sufferings: For God hath set up the work of Redemption, as that wherein he expecteth to be as much honoured as in the work of Creation. Suppose the Kings Messengers, *Mat.* 22. should have told those whom they invited, [Though we are commanded to invite you all to the Wedding, yet the truth is, there is not half provision enough made ready for you all, if you should come, but yet we are commanded to perswade you all, because the King knows your minds that you will not come] should these Messengers have deserved thanks for such a Message.

Arg.

Arg. 13. *A Debito Amoris & gratitudinis erga Redemptorem.*

If all Men do owe Love and thankfulneſs to Chriſt for his ſatisfying for their Sins, and for the Fruits of that ſatisfaction, then he hath ſatisfied for all, But all Men do owe him love and thankfulneſs, *&c. ergo, &c.*

I mean, all Men that hear of Chriſt, are bound to love him as Redeemer, and be thankful to him for making ſatisfaction for them, and thoſe that never heard of him are bound to love *Deum Miſerecordem*, God as merciful to them and to be thankful for thoſe mercies which are the Fruits of Chriſts Death.

The Antecedent hath two Parts, 1. That all are bound to love and gratitude 2. That they owe theſe for Chriſts dying for them. And as to the debt it ſelf. I hope few Chriſtians will deny it: For if they do, 1. They will deny a great part of the Law of Chriſt, and if ſuch a curſe be denounced againſt him that addeth or diminiſheth, as to the Law of ceremonies, what ſhall be due to him that wipeth out ſo great a part of the Goſpel at a daſh? 2. It is plainly High Treaſon, to diſcharge ſo many of Chriſts Subjects of their Allegiance, or of the chief part of their duty, even Love and Gratitude: His Subjects I may call them, though Rebellious; becauſe though they acknowledg him not, or not ſincerely, yet he is their rightful Lord. 3. It is notorious compliance with Satan, to ſay, Duty is no Duty, and that ſo great Duties as theſe; and that Sin is no Sin, and that ſuch hainous Sins.

4. If tendeth most desperately to the Damnation of Souls, by drawing them to neglect these duties, and hardening them in impenitency when they have done. For if it be no duty to Love Christ for Redeeming them, and to be thankful for it, then it is no Sin not to love him, and not to be thankful, and if it be no Sin, they need not repent of it. 5. They will wickedly justifie Men from the Accusation of the guilt of these Sins, at the Bar of Christ, and dare any that now boldly maintain this cause in dispute, undertake to justifie and vindicate them at Judgment, and prove, that it was never their duty to love Christ, or be thankful to him for Redeeming them, and therefore that it was not their Sin, that they did it not? This will be a harder task, then it is now to find a flourish of words which seem to prove it. 6. And worse then all this, They will condemn Christ for condemning them for these Sins. When he hath sentenced them, [Go you cursed] For not loving him and shewing it to his Members, *Mat.* 25. And pronounced that Man *Anathema Maranatha* that loves not the Lord Jesus; if these Men can prove that it was none of their duty, then they must accuse Christ and his Law of injustice, and condemn his condemnatory sentence.

2. And as they owe Christ this Love and Gratitude, so the thing that they owe it for, is his Redeeming them, or dying in their stead, or satisfying for their Sin: For 1. It is doubtless that they owe it him, not only as Creator but as Redeemer, and if so, it is either for Redeeming others, or themselves. Not only for Redeeming others: For 1. The nature of

of gratitude is to respect some benefits that our selves receive, (either in our own Persons, or in those whose welfare is part of ours) And 2. Man is naturally so near to himself, and the love of himself, so deeply rooted by God in his nature, that he naturally looks at himself before others, and values things as they respect himself. 3. Others good is no mercy to us, further then we participate with them in the benefit; Yea Divines generally conclude, that it will be so far from comforting the damned to see that the Godly are in Heaven, that it will encrease their torment. 4. Else it would lay no greater an obligation on these Men to love Christ and be thankful to him, than it doth on the Devils, that Men are redeemed, or than they owe God, that the good Angels are preserved while themselves are condemned. 5. Scripture not only alloweth Men to love and be thankful in reference to our selves, even for that which is good to us, but shews it to be our duty, and the nature of those affections; and that for our own mercies received, we are obliged hereto, 2 *Thes.* 2. 10 Men are forsaken and damned for not receiving the love of the Truth that they might be saved. How oft are the *Israelites* (all of them) Commanded to love the Lord with all their Hearts, as their Redeemer from *Egypt*, which was both an effect and Type of Christs work of Redemption. *Deut.* 6. 5. and 10. 12. and 11. 1, 13, 22. and 19. 9. and 30. 16. 20 Yea all Gods mercies as well as this deliverance from *Egypt*, is made, in divers of these Texts, the motive that should provoke them to love and thankfulness: And doubtless, these are all effects of the Death of Christ for them. To love for

love and for benefits is that which Sinners do, *Luk.* 6. 32. Not as Sinners, but from the common humanity that is left in them. We love him, because he first loved us, 1 *Joh.* 4. 19. This [because] is not meant only *Effectivè*, but also *objectivè*, as to Gods love. The first love of the Soul to Christ cannot be moved from the knowledg of Christs special love to the Soul: (For 1. Love accompanieth justifying Faith in the same moment, (And indeed in some Sense is part of it) And doth not stay till the Soul discern his own believing, and thence discern Gods special love. 2. There is a love of desire, which goes before the knowledg of Gods special love 3. Many a poor Christian loves Christ long before they know the special love of Christ) And therefore this first sincere love must needs be raised from the apprehension of Christs excellency as to us, and his general love to mankind: Which can be no other then that which is manifested in their Redemption.

Object: *Wicked Men are bound first to believe and then to love, when they know by their believing that Christ died for them.*

Anſ. They are bound immediately in the same instant to love Christ as to believe; and not to delay their love till they try their Faith, or by discerning it get assurance of Gods favour. They are bound to accept Christ as good for them, when he is offered them: And that acceptance is essentially love, as it is said to be in the rational appetite. He that loveth not truly, believeth not truly. And how can any Man prove Gods special

special love by the evidence of a false Faith? Must Men first believe without love that by the Mark of such a Faith they may have ground for love? That will be a deceitful ground, as it is a deceitfull Mark.

Object *At least, Men are bound to be humbled first, and believe that there is no other name under Heaven but Christs, by which they can be saved; and then to rest on him, and love him.*

Ans. This is answered before. If the humiliation and Assent that they mention be proper to the Regenerate, and so be a true note of Gods special love 1. Then it will follow that other Graces go before that Faith which unites us to Christ, (Which few will grant) 2. Then Men must find special Marks Antecedent to Faith that from thence they may gather a warrant to believe: Which is false Doctrine, I think, in the judgment of all 2. But if these Antecedent Acts be common and such as reprobates also may perform, then either every Man that performs them is bound to love Christ as his Redeemer (And to rest on him for pardon) Or only some: If every Man, then some reprobates are bound to love Christ as their Redeemer (And to rest on him for pardon by his Blood shed for them) And to be thankful for his satisfaction: And then certainly Christ did Redeem them by satisfying for them. If but some, then how shall any Man know that he is one of them. So that I think I may conclude, that they that deny universal satisfaction by Christs bloodshed, do leave Men no ground for their first special love to Christ as

Redeemer: For that first love, must be raised upon the knowledg of Christs general love and mercy, or be groundless, Seeing there is no knowledg of special love and Mercy Antecedent.

Object *But how can the knowledg of Christs common love cause in us a special love to him. Then we must love him first with a special love.*

Anſ. Christ hath a special love to us, before we have a special love to him: But we cannot know it, and therefore cannot love him for it. His special love is the efficient cause of our love to him, but not the objective or moving cause of our first love. The love of Christ is not the less because its manifestation is general. And therefore that glorious mercy of general satisfaction, though common, not only may be, but is, the ground or motive of our first special love, if it be orderly and rightly raised: though Christs special love be the efficient.

Object *Then none do love God a right at first but those that hold Universal Redemption.*

Anſ. 1. Yet they may love him sincerely, though they are brought to it (through the fault of their Teachers) in a disadvantageous and disorderly way, 2. Young Converts are not used so soon to be troubled with the Controversy of Universal Redemption. 3. I have known few in my observation, but at their first closing with Christ, they have had the same judgment of the Universality of Christs satisfaction (so

(so as to be sufficient for all Sinners and wanting only their own Faith to make it effectual to Remission) which I plead for. 4. It is the usual way of Preachers in their popular Sermons to speak far more soundly in these points then in their disputations: And indeed their way of Preaching for the Conversion of Sinners, doth plainly intimate Universal satisfaction; For they use to lay all the blame on the Wills of Sinners (and justly) as that only which can deprive them of the benefits of Christs sufferings, and to urge them to accept him, and to let them know that their case is not left remediless and desperate: Yea and to tell them plainly that Christs Death is sufficient for all, to pardon all their Sins be they never so many or great, and if they will believe they shall have the Fruits of it: Which is in other words to say [Christ hath satisfied for all] So that upon these right grounds they use to bring Men to believe and love Christ at the first, and then they must have some longer time before they can pervert them again, by working out these apprehensions, and acquainting them, that Christ hath not satisfied for all, but for the Elect only.

Object *Mens first love to Christ, is not to him for what he hath done, but for what he can do for us, and as he is to us a desirable good; because it is but* Amor Concupiscentiæ.

Answ. It is also a love of gratitude: And all the good that we can expect from him for the future, or desire him for, is but the fruit of what he hath done for us already, and therefore presup-

ſuppoſeth it: And he that looketh for Mercy from Chriſt as not procured by his ſatisfactory ſufferings, knows not the Goſpel nor what he expecteth. The Goſpel at its firſt Preaching is glad tidings, and brings news firſt of what Chriſt hath done for Men, and next, of what he will further do.

Object *But it is not for Dying* [*for me in particular*] *that I am firſt obliged to love Chriſt; but for paying a ſufficient price.*

Anſ. 1. If by [For me in particular] you mean [more for me then others] I grant it: But it is for dying and ſatisfying for fallen Mankind in general, of whom I am a Member. 2. I have ſhewed that according to this New Doctrin, Chriſts Death is not ſufficient to pardon all, if they did repent; nor formally a ſufficient price but only materially or Aptitudinally, ſufficient to have been a price. Now that this can engage any to love or thankfulneſs is paſt my reach to apprehend: For it is not a benefit, (to ſuch as for whom it was no price.) If 100 Men lie in Priſon for debt, and one ſhall pay as much for the debt and diſcharge often of them as was ſufficient to have ſatisfied for the debts of them all, and yet would not pay it for them, but rather give it ſuperfluouſly then that they ſhould have any benefit by it, how doth this oblige theſe Priſoners to love and thankfulneſs to this Man? At leaſt, not as any Redeemer or Friend of theirs? Rather they will think him envious and an Enemy to them, that would rather caſt away his Mo-

ny

ny (Giving for one that which was sufficient for all) then they should have any benefit by it.

Object *But it is not for his Death, that Men are bound at first to love Christ and be thankful, but for the free and general offer of himself and his benefits to them in the Gospel.*

Anſ. 1. The negative is wicked and Unchristian 2. The part affirmed is a contradiction to their denial of Universal satisfaction. For Christ is offered to Men as their Redeemer only. And the Word [Redeemer] signifies 1. One that hath paid a price for them already 2. One that will recover them by the effectual conveyance of his benefits, if they accept his offer. And the later always implies the former: The effect cannot be without its cause. He is no Redeemer to them for whom he suffered not. And he cannot be a Redeemer to them by Pardon and Salvation, for whom he hath not been already a Redeemer by satisfaction. And he doth not offer to satisfie for them *de futuro*, a new, and therefore the offer certainly proves a general satisfaction, as is shewed before. 3. And if Christ offer himself to any Men, as their Redeemer whom he never did Redeem, no nor can Redeem by Remission and Salvation, because he hath not first Redeemed them by price and satisfaction, charging the refusal upon them to their deep damnation, doth this oblige Men to love and gratitude? If he procure by his Death no possibility of their Salvation, but induce a necessity of their deep condemnation? If he offer them the benefits of a death never suffered for them

them, (that is effects without their cause) and which he cannot give them, and destroy them for not receiving them; Is this all the obligation?

Object. *But it is the Law of God that obligeth them to love and gratitude: And therefore they are obliged, though Christ be none of their Redeemer, and though his Death were not a benefit to them.*

Ans. 1. These are duties that result *ex natura rei*, viz. *boni oblati, & beneficii collati*, and so from the Law of nature, and not from a meer positive Law. Love and gratitude are not ceremonies, and therefore where the nature of the thing obligeth not, there is no obligation. 2. There must be an objective cause of love and gratitude, as well as an efficient, and exemplary cause; And therefore our question is only of the objective cause. God doth not alter the nature of love and gratitude by commanding them; He doth not command love that hath not good for its object (for there is no such thing *in rerum natura*) nor doth he command a gratitude that is not for a benefit.

Object. *But it is unknown to them whether Christ died for them or not, For ought they know he did, And therefore they are bound to love and gratitude.*

Ans. 1. An unknown benefit bindeth not to love and thankfulness. 2. It is Real favours and not feigned, that Christ obligeth Men by: As it is

is real love and thanks and not feigned that he expecteth from them. 3. Else that common love and thankfulness which the Non-elect do give Christ as their Redeemer, would be a mistake. 4. And when their Eyes were opened in Hell, they would repent that they loved Christ at all, and were thankful to him at all, seeing they would then discern it was upon a mistake, and for a benefit that was never given them or for them: Whereas contrarily they will be convinced then of their Sin and folly in loving Christ no more, and being no more thankful.

Yet further, that these Men are bound to love and gratitude to Christ as their Redeemer, I will add some more Scripture proof. 1. If the Non-elect are not bound to love Christ for Redeeming them or not dying for them, then the Elect are not bound to it, till they know themselves to be Elect; But the consequent is false, therefore so is the Antecedent. He that dare say, No Man in the World is bound to love Christ and be thankful to him for dying for him, till he know he is Elect (That is, have assurance of Salvation which so so few attain to at all, or at least so many Christians want) Dare say that which I dare not, *Rom* 5. 8. *But God commended his love to us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. Joh.* 3. 16. *God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever*, &c. 1. If Gods love to the World and Sinners before Conversion, in his Redeeming them by Christ, be propounded to the consideration of unconverted Sinners, then it is to manifest that they owe him love again and thankfulness for it: But the Antecedent is true, therefore so is the consequent.

These

These Texts and many other do propound the consideration of Gods love, in Redeeming them, to Men before Conversion (as might abundantly be proved) and that must need intimate their duty of love and gratitude, or else the Law of nature is abrogated, which bindeth us to return love and thankfulness for love and benefits. 2. Let me add one other Argument for the Minor (*viz.* that the Elect are bound to love and gratitude to Christ as their Redeemer, before they know themselves to be Elect) and it is such a one, as I think, makes the case so clear, that it will be hard for the most prejudiced not to discern it, if they will consider it.

If the Elect are not bound to love and gratitude for Christs Redeeming them, before they know themselves to be Elect, then they are never bound to it at all, (and so never ought to perform it) But the consequent is intollerable, *Ergo, &c.*

The consequence is proved thus. They cannot know themselves to be elect (unless by extraordinary Revelation) till they first know their love and gratitude to Christ for Redeeming them; Therefore if they are not bound to love and gratitude before they know themselves Elect, then they are never bounnd to it. The reason of the consequence is, that the same thing cannot be. [Before] and [Not before] before their knowledg of Election, and not before it. If it must go before the knowledg of Election, then they were obliged to it before (for that we are not obliged to, is no duty and that which is no duty, is no Mark of Election:) but it must go before, *Ergo &c.*

The

The Antecedent is proved thus, There is no other sign without this love and gratitude which is sufficient to discover a Man to be Elect; Therefore no Man can know himself to be elect (by ordinary means) without the knowledg of these.

Two things will be replied, to this. 1. That Faith is before love and gratitude, and a sufficient sign. 2. That it may be known without signs by the Testimony of the Spirit.

To these in order. And 1. For Faith, as it is in the will and is the acceptance of an offered Christ, is the same thing with love, as love is in the rational appetite, as I have elsewhere fully proved; *& Aqvinas* oft expresseth this love to be but *velle bonum*. 2. If love be distinct (as it is exercised on the same object, for else there's no question of it) Yet it is certain that it is concomitant, and doth not in one moment of time come after Faith: Much less so long as that a Man must first by reflection discern his Faith before he be obliged to love. 3. Faith is no true faith that is not accompanied with love, and a false faith can be no true sign of Election, as is said before. The Acts of Justifying Faith in the Will are principally these two. 1. To accept of Christ as he is offered; Now he is offered as a Redeemer, *i.e.* 1. As one that for the time past hath paid the price of our Redemption. 2. And for the time to come will give us the benefits of it, on his own terms. Now Christ cannot be received as a Redeemer, without respect to both. He that receiveth him to pardon and save him any other way then by the price of his Blood already shed, doth not receive him

him as he is offered, nor as the Redeemer; And if it be necessary that he must be received in respect to what he hath done for us, as well as what he will do, then it is as necessary that he be loving and thankfully received. For as *bonum recipitur volendo*, which is our love; and cannot possibly be received *quâ bonum* but lovingly; so *bonum preteritum* is the object of this *Amor Gratitudinis*, (The benefit may remain, but the act of the benefactor is past) as *bonum futurum* is the object of *Amor Concupiscentiæ*, & *Bonum Presens*, of *Amor Complacentiæ*. So that no Man living can know that he hath received Christ as a Redeemer, if he do not know that he hath lovingly and thankfully received him. And no Man can know the good that Christ will do for the future, nor receive it, without knowing the good that he hath done in his Sacrifice for the time past, and thankfully acknowledging it. 2. After acceptance of an offered Christ, the next Act, is affiance (which most Divines make the Principal, and some the only justifying Act) And this presupposing the loving consent, acceptance, the *Velle*, before mentioned, I do not need to prove, that affiance is no certain Mark of Election, without love; Nay moreover, as it presupposeth love, so it containeth love in its own nature, as every Act of the will toward goodness, must needs do. I rest on Christ as one to do me good for the future by virtue of his ransome already paid; and so here is still the double good, past and present, which affiance doth respect, or else it is not in Christ as Redeemer that we have affiance. 3. The like I might easily shew in respect of desire after Christ: An early Grace, and

and before which none finds a distinct certain sign of his Election: Yet goodness is its object, and love is in its nature; from whence we use the term of *Amor Concupiscentiæ.*

Object. *But you said before, that the Faith and Love of Young Converts that hold not Universal Satisfaction may be sincere, though not rightly ordered, grounded or raised.*

Answ. True, for if one should conceit that Christ Dyed but for *Englishmen*, or for a very few at least, and that he is one of those few, he might truly love Christ for dying for him; though yet he grounded his apprehension amiss of his interest in Christ. But still here is no certainty of Faith, without certainty of Love: Nor certainty or any knowledge of Election, without the knowledge of both Faith and Love.

Object. *Then a* Socinian *can have no certainty of Election: For he that believeth not Christs Satisfaction can have no Love or Thankfulness for it.*

Answ. No wonder if he have no certainty of Election, who can have no grounded hope of Salvation. If it be not only some circumstances, or Terms or Law-notions; but the substance of this Doctrine, which any Man shall deny, *viz.* That Christ hath taken away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself, and having made Purgation of our sins, is ascended, *&c. And hath by one Sacrifice perfected for ever them that are sanctified, and became a Curse for us, to free us from the Curse,*

and so hath taken away the Sins of the World (quoad pretium,) *And hath born our transgressions, that we might be healed by his stripes, and hath Dyed for us, the just for the unjust, so that now we must be justified by his Blood*: I say, he that believeth not this, I think is no Christian. See 1 *Cor.* 5. 7. *Heb.* 9. 26. and 10. 1, 2. *&c.* and 1. 3. and 10. 14. *Gal.* 3. 13. *Isa.* 53. 4, 5. *John* 1. 29. 1 *Pet.* 3. 18. *Eph.* 1. 17. *Rom.* 3. 25. and 5. 9. *Col.* 1. 20. *Heb.* 9. 22. and 13. 12. 1. *Pet.* 1. 2. 19.

I know nothing more of moment that can be here objected and therefore will go to the next Reply.

2. Which was, that men may know their Election by the Testimony of the Spirit.

To which I answer.

1. The Spirit sheweth to us the things given of God, of which Love to Christ is a principal.

2. The Spirit witnesseth our Election mediately and not immediately (that I know of.) 1. By giving those graces that will prove it, and do flow from it. 2. By exciting them. 3. By illuminating us to see them, and try by them. 4. Filling the Soul with those sweet affections, which are a kind of taste of the Love of God: But all affections are raised *mediante intellectu*, and therefore knowledge goes before them. Who can know that he rejoyceth Spiritually, and that his Joy is a fruit of Election, that knoweth not why he rejoiceth.

3. However, it is desperate Doctrine to teach poor Christians, that they have no ground to

Love

Love or Thank Christ for Redeeming them, till the Spirit have without any signs revealed their Election to them (which I think it never doth.

Lastly, The Spirit witnesseth with our Spirit: Now our Spirit witnesseth only from evidence that we are Gods Children, and not without; and therefore whether the Spirit be a concurring witness in the same Testimony, or its Testimony be a concomitant Testimony, distinct from though conjunct with that of our Conscience, (I think the former) yet alls one to the point in hand, seeing they witness together.

So much for the *Minor*, *viz.* that the Elect are bound to love and thankfulness for Redemption before they know themselves Elect. Now for the consequence of the Major, it it clear from what is said, that the Elect could not be bound to this, except the Non-Elect are also: Because (as is proved) no Man can know whether he be Elect or not, before he know himself so much as obliged to love and gratitude for Redemption. For Elect and Non-Elect are not to be discerned till Faith and love do put a difference. And therefore, methinks, I may conclude confidently, that the Non-Elect are bound to love and thankfulness for Redemption, or satisfaction, and therefore they are redeemed or satisfyed for.

If any shall make the common objection, *viz.* The Non-elect, or the Elect not yet converted are bound to love and gratitude to Christ for satisfying for all that will believe, I have answered this oft already.

1. The Doctrine which I oppose is that Christ hath not only died for Men if they will believe, but died only for the Elect that they might believe; so that it is determined by name for whom he Died, and the rest he Died not for at all; and therefore his Dying for another, is not that which obligeth a man to Thankfulness: And their Ignorance that they are excluded, I have shewed, can add no obligation.

2. Mens believing will not cause Christ to Die for them, nor is it a condition of it, as if Christ would Die for Men if they will believe; Believing presupposeth Christs Dying for us, and what then can be their meaning that say Christ Died and Satisfied for all men if they will Believe? When they say absolutely withal, that he Died not for all at all, but only for the Elect, that they might believe. Will they say that he Died for the Non-elect, if they will believe? Then either they must mean that he underwent the Penalty, and left it undetermined *quorum loco*, in whose stead and for whose sins it should be, till their believing determine it: But 1. This is as much denyed by those whom I oppose, as by me. 2. And it is a contradiction. For it is Essential to Punishment to be *propter peccatum*; that Relation is its formal Nature, as it differs from Affliction in general; And therefore Christ suffered no Punishment, if it were not determinately for Sin: And the meritorious cause is considered as before the effect, and not after it; Or else if they speak of [Believing] not as any condition on mans part, but a Divinely-infused Character of those for whom Christ Died, then the sence of their words is but this [Christ Died

ed for the Non-elect, if they be Elect] or [Christ satisfied for all men, if all men be Elect] or [Christ Died in stead of all, if he will give Faith to all.] And who sees not that these words are a plain Negation, and all one with these [Christ satisfied not for all] *q. d.* [I leave in my Will such a Legacy to *Titus*, if *Titus* be not *Titus*, but *Sempronius*] what Lawyer knows not that is a denyal, or an illusory nothing! And how then can this bind men to Love and Gratitude.

If I could bethink me of any other considerable Objection I would answer it: But I cannot.

Furthermore for the Antecedency of the obligation to love, mark how Christ maketh it a condition to his own Love and his Fathers (as in a greater degree, and as manifested) *Joh.* 14. 21. *He that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest my self to him.* Christ Loveth Men before they Love, as he is *Dominus Absolutus* and a free Benefactor, (and as a Natural Lover of his own Workmanship) But he loveth man after his Faith and Love to him as *Rector per Leges*, as putting on the resemblance of goodness, and justice in civil Sense, and as he now stands in that Relation to them, in which he is by his own Law, as it were obliged to do them good: Note this difference of Christs love, *Prov.* 8. 17. *I love those that love me, and those that seek me early shall find me.* So *ver.* 21. *Luke* 7. 47. *Many sins are forgiven, for she loved much.* If it be meant [therefore she loved much] yet it would not make against this.

From *John* 3. 19. I argue thus. If men are condemned for loving darkneſs rather than Light, (and Chriſt is this Light) then they were obliged to love Chriſt the Light. But, *&c. Ergo*, &c.

And I have ſhewed it is as Redeemer that he muſt be loved: For to Love Chriſt as an excellent Prophet only, that a *Turk* may do, for *Mahomet* ſo confeſſeth him to be. *Mat.* 10. 37. It is Chriſts condition propounded to all, *That if they love not him better than Father, Mother, Houſe, Land or Life they cannot be his Diſciples*; So that thoſe that are not yet his Diſciples, are obliged at once to love him above all, and become his Diſciples. 1 *Cor.* 16. 22. *If any man love not the Lord Jeſus Chriſt let him be* Anathema, Maran-atha.

And then more ſpecially for Gratitude (becauſe I have hitherto inſiſted on the other ſpecies, Love) there are many Parables in the Goſpel that ſhew that wicked men are condemned for ingratitude to their Redeemer, *Mat.* 21. 37, 40. *&c.* Chriſt convinceth his Auditors, that thoſe unthankful Husband-men, that refuſed to pay the Fruits, and killed the Son that was ſent to them; (he was ſent to be entertained as Redeemer) would deſervedly be deſtroyed with a miſerable deſtruction, and the Vineyard let out to others, *i. e.* that the Kingdom of God ſhould be taken from them and given to a Nation bringing forth the Fruits thereof. And what is that Kingdom (here meant) but the Goſpel? The proclaiming and offer of Chriſt as Redeemer, and of mercy in and with him? *Mat.* 22. 8. It is unthankful refuſal of the feaſt prepared, when all things were ready, and they invited which was the *unworthi-*

neſs

ness that there is mentioned, which shut out those Guests, *Mat.* 18. 32. Unthankfulness is intimated as part of the Sin of that wicked Servant, who took his fellow Servant by the throat for 100. Pence, when himself had been forgiven 10000 Talents: [*I forgave thee all the debt*] signifieth such a mercy as Men may have that perish (as is plain *verse* 34. 35.) and yet certainly presupposeth Christs dying for them, and obligeth them to thankfulness: If any ask the sense of the Text, I shall give it after by it self more fitly.

Let me therefore conclude thus. That Doctrin which subverteth a very great part of Religion is not of God: But so doth this which denieth Universal satisfaction: Therefore it is not of God. The *Minor* is proved from what is said: It destroyeth the ground of all Mens first love to Christ for Redeeming them: It justifieth all the Non-Elect in their ingratitude and not loving Christ as their Redeemer: Besides what was said before of its destroying the use of repentance and all Means. But we shall recollect more of these consequences in the end, and shew you more fully the face of the Doctrin which I dispute against.

I have proved that all Men that hear the Gospel, owe Christ love and thankfulness for Redeeming them by dying for them. I should next shew that all Men in the World do owe God love and thankfulness for those mercies which are the effects of Christs satisfaction: But especially those within the Church who have in the New Covenant, made over to them a conditional remission of their Sins, and adoption, and everlasting life, *viz.* If they will accept Christ with his benefits: Those that are sanctified with

the Blood of the Covenant, and are made partakers of the Holy Ghost and were escaped from the pollutions of the World through the knowledg of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and and have tasted the good word of God and the Powers of the World to come, &c. Certainly these have received the fruits of Christs satisfaction for which they were bound to be thankful. But of those more particularly in their place.

Arg. 14th. *Acertitudine fidei, & possibilitate rectè credendi.*

If Christ hath not satisfied for the Sins of all, then no Man hath a sufficient ground for his first justifying Faith: (All Men are left at an utter uncomfortable uncertainty whether they may believe to Justification or not) But the consequent is false: Therefore so is the Antecedent.

That which is said before doth shew so much of the grounds of this Argument, that I shall be the shorter in it now. All the doubt is of the consequence of the Major, and to clear that, I suppose it is granted that all firm, sufficient Faith for justification, must not only have a command to warrant it, but also a fit object about which it must be exercised. God commandeth no Man to believe a falshood to make it become true by believing it, nor to trust to a person or promise that is not to be trusted, as being not only fallible, but certainly will deceive. As for the Act of affiance or recumbency, commonly called the justifying Act, no Man can groundedly or comfortably

comfortably rest on Christ for justification by his Blood, who doth not first know that his Blood was shed for him, and hath satisfied for him: Else he must rest on that which he knows not to be sufficient for him to rest upon: For it hath been proved that Christs death is not sufficient to justifie any for whom it was not suffered, though they should believe. He suffered not superfluously, as I have shewed: Take the confession of a Divine that for fear of Arminianism joyned Hands with the Antimonians, *Maccovius colleg. disp. de justif. disp. 5. §. 22. Quoad substantiam pœnæ nihil plus perpessus est Christus quam per legem debebatur: Neq; enim vel Amor Patris, vel etiam justitia permittere potuit, plura ut filio imponerentur, quam quæ illi necessariò tanquam sponsori ferenda erant; Quoad circumstantias autem, patientis personam, patiendi causam, passionis efficaciam plusquam sufficiens satisfactio Christi. Neque enim lex requirebat ut Deus moreretur, neque ut sine peccato proprio quis moreretur, neque mors talis quæ suffecisset pro peccatis totius mundi, sive pro omnibus & singulis hominibus.* Here he confesseth that Christ suffered no more than was due by Law, and than was necessary for him to suffer as Sponsor: And yet that his Death was sufficient for the Sins of all the World, even for all Men and every Man. And if so, then either he suffered as *Sponsor* for all: Or else circumstances did make that Death sufficient for all, which yet *quoad substantiâ pœnæ* (as he calls it) had none of that which the Law required, and was necessary for the *Sponsor* to undergo. And thus I think (with that added which is said before) it is evident that none have ground to rest on Christs Blood to justifie them, or on Christ to justifie

them

them by his Blood, till they know that his Blood was shed for them seeing it is sufficient for no more. But no Man before justifying Faith knows that Christs Blood was shed for him any more then for others that shall never be justified by it, therefore no Man hath ground thus to believe. And for the intellectual Act of Faith, if it be that which *Maccovius* saith it is *ibid. disput.* 3. §. 17. *Fides in Christum quæ requiritur a nobis ad nostri justificationem est, ut credamus pro redemptionem & sanguinem nos justificari & salvari*, then most Men are bound to believe an untruth, if they are bound to believe to justification. If it be said that, it is to believe that Christs Death is sufficient to pardon him if he believe, I answer that no Man can truly believe that neither, but he that first knows that he died for him, which none can do but he that knows that he died for all. I marvail how such Divines (as *Twiss* and *Maccovius* who hold the main Antimonian Principles) who say that Faith justifieth only as we are ascertained, or receive the knowledg of justification already past at Christs death, can tell how to Salve this. How can they choose but say, that either God doth not command all where the Gospel comes to believe to justification, or else, that he commands most Men to believe a falshood: Or else, that all Men are justified by Christs death.

Let me add here (for I will not make another Argument of it, being built on the same grounds with the former) that if Christ died not for all, then not only all Men at their first invitation, but even all true believers whenever they loose the sight of their evidences, that is, of their own

own Faith and other Graces, have no ground left them to renew an Act of justifying Faith, nor to cast their Souls with any confidence on Christ: For as long as he knows not himself to be Elect and a true believer, he cannot tell whether, Christ died for him, and consequently he knows not whether he may rest on him as a sufficient Redeemer, as nor knowing whether he satisfied for him or not. If any say, he must believe that he may know, I answer 1. It must be a revealed truth before it is believed. 2. Believing will not make it true, if it were not true before. We are not to believe that Christ may die for us, but to believe that he did die for us. Hear *Maccovius* his confession of that also, *Ibid disp.* 9. §. 16. *At toto cælo errat Hæreticus* (Socinus) *Neque enim fidem requiri ad hoc dicimus, ut pro nobis satisfiat; sed ut pro fidem satisfactio ista Christi qua perac ta est ante fidem nobis innotescat* (so that when God commandeth Men to believe, he commandeth them to take knowledg of Christs satisfaction for them before made: And surely men cannot know that which is not true, unless it be to know it to be false.) And thus it seems plain to me that many, if not most true believers will be left without any sufficient ground to believe, through a great part of their lives. For I think, assurance is not so common a thing as some imagine, nor so constant with them that have it: Though *Maccovius* saith (as one Error draws on another) *Ibid. disp.* 9. §. 11. *Respondeo, (salvo aliorum judicio) negando sensum illum (qui in nobis oritur ex agnitione nostræ Justificationis) aliquando tolli penitus in homine*: Our Divines that teach poor Souls to use their Faith of Adherence when they want evidence, do

do go another way to work; and suppose an Universal promise and before that an Universal satisfaction: Or else Adherence without evidence hath no sufficient object or ground, and then farewel the Christians most constant stay.

Arg. 15. *Ab ordine credendi perverso.*

If Christ satisfied not for all, then the knowledg or assurance that we have justifying Faith must go before justifying Faith: But that is impossible as being a contradiction, *Ergo, &c.*

The reason of the consequence is plain in what was said on the last argument. For no Man can believe to justification, but by believing that Christ is a sufficient Redeemer, and hath made sufficient satisfaction for his Sins, and by accepting him as offered to apply the fruits of that satisfaction to us, and by resting on him for those fruits. Now all this hath no ground till a Man knows that Christ hath already died and satisfied for him: And that cannot be known (if Christ died not for all) till Men first know themselves to be Elect and believers, and that cannot be known till after we do believe; For if the thing to be believed is that Christ died for believers, and for me if I believe, I must know that I believe before I can know that he died for me, and yet I must know that he hath died and satisfied for me before I can believe to Justification. See what contradictions are here, and how Men are put upon impossibilities, I know the necessity of believing that Christ hath satisfied for me, is denied but I have proved it before.

Arg.

Arg. 16. *A peccatorum aggravatione.*

If it be the great aggravation of all Mens Sins committed against that mercy which tendeth to their Recovery, that they are against the Lord that died for them, then Christ did die for all such Men: But the Antecedent is true, *Ergo, &c.*

Only the Antecedent requires proof; That wicked Men do partake of Mercy tending towards their recovery, (as to the nature of the mercy, and in Gods legal Ordination) I think I need not prove among Christians; And that they Sin against such mercy, is a thing that needs as little proof; The main proof of the Antecedent [that these mens Sins are aggravated, in that they are against Christ that died for them] will be from several Texts of Scripture which do thus aggravate such Mens Sin, which because I intend to handle particularly, I will refer you thereto, and now pass them by. Further, 1. It is confessed that these Mens Sin is aggravated in that they are against the Blood of Christ as offered to them in its Fruits, and as against Christ himself offered to them as Crucified and as Redeemer, and as against the offers of pardon, Adoption and Salvation, which are all Fruits of Christs satisfaction. But all these imply satisfaction for them to whom they are offered, as is proved already, *Ergo &c.* Many of our Divines (as *Perkins Reform. Cathol. of Justif.* and others) say that in this we differ from the Papists, that they make Christs satisfaction to be but the meritorious cause of our Righteousness, but not our Righteousness it self as we affirm it (I do not now judg

judg of these words, but) if Christs satisfaction be our very Righteousness or any part of it, then certainly Christ satisfied for all to whom he offers his Righteousness: But that he offers his Righteousness to all without exception is beyond doubt: And he would never offer them a *Non-ens*, that which is not: He doth not offer to one Man the satisfaction made only for another and not for him, for that would be no Righteousness for him: But it is Righteousness that Christ offers, and therefore it is satisfaction for that sinner himself which is offered to that sinner, to be his Righteousness. Now the offer supposeth the being of the thing offered, except it were only an offer to do or give something hereafter, which is not the case here. And for them that say, [Christ is only offered toMen if they will receive him, or believe] it is idle: For Christ is offered to Men whether they will receive him or not, but none but receivers do enjoy him. God doth not make our receiving the condition of his offering, as to say [I will offer thee Christs satisfaction if thou wilt receive it] but he makes it the condition of our attaining the good offered *q. d.* [Christ with his benefits offered to thee shall be thine if thou wilt receive him.]

2. If it be only the Blood of Christ shed for others, and not for them which unbelievers sin against, then the sin of Devils might (as to this respect) be as well aggravated from the Blood of Christ sinned against as theirs: But the consequence is palpably absurd, *Ergo &c.*

3. Consider what hainous consequents will follow, if you deny this aggravation of the Sins of unbelievers. 1. You harden them in the most desperate

deſperate impenitency: For they cannot repent of that which they know not to be a Sin, and they cannot know that they have ſinned againſt him that dyed for them, till they know that he did die for them; and who dare ſay to all the World, that yet know not that they are true believers, [you ought not to repent for any Sin as being committed againſt him that died for you.] *Perkins Treat.* of repentance, and multitudes of our godly Engliſh Writers when they preſs Men to repentance, do uſe this as the greateſt motive, to conſider what our Sins did coſt the Lord Jeſus. They coſt him Blood, and ſhould they not coſt us tears? and ſhould we make light of that which lay ſo heavy on him? Such arguings are common in almoſt all Writers and Preachers: Now if Chriſt did not bear all Mens Sins, and if all Mens Sins did not coſt Chriſt ſo dear, then this Argument or Motive to repentance can be uſed to no Man, nor by any Man but only thoſe that have got aſſurance of a ſpecial intereſt in Chriſt. 2. Hereby you deny that God may juſtly agravate Mens Sins, or condemn Men for Sinning againſt Chriſt that died for them. 3. Hereby you perſwade Men that their conſciences ſhall not thus agravate them in Hell, nor torment them for Sinning againſt him that ſuffered for them, all which I ſhall ſhew anon, to be falſe. 4. Hereby you forbid Miniſters from thus aggravating their Peoples Sins, and ſo from uſing the moſt effectual motive to draw them to repentance. And hereby you condemn almoſt all the moſt powerful Preachers in *England*, who generally take this courſe. And you reject the moſt powerful Books and Sermons which God hath

hath bleſt to the Converſion of many Souls. I mention this, the rather becauſe ſome ſtill object that thoſe who are againſt Univerſal Redemption ſucceed as much in their Miniſtry to the Converſion of Souls, as thoſe that are for it: The reaſon is, becauſe they commonly Preach for it, or on grounds that ſuppoſe it, in their practical Sermons, when in their diſputes they ſpeak againſt it. That you may ſee I wrong them not, I will inſtance in one, learned, Holy *Perkins*: who hath writ more confidently againſt Univerſal Redemption then he? And when he comes to win Men to Repentance and to Chriſt, ſee how he Writes, in particular in that excellent ſhort Treatiſe, the choiceſt piece I think that ever he wrote, I am ſure a piece that hath long agoe workt more on my own Heart then moſt, if not then any that ever I read, and which I have cauſe to thank God that ever I ſaw: I mean his Treat. *of the Right Knowledg of Chriſt Crucified* in the firſt Vol. of his Works, *Page* 626, *&c.* I will tranſcribe ſome paſſages *Page* 626. When he hath ſhewed that we muſt feel the need of Chriſt, and deſire him, he adds [The 2d. Part of knowledg is Application (every Man is bound to apply Chriſt) whereby thou muſt know and believe, not only that Chriſt was Crucified, but that he was Crucified for thee, for thee I ſay in particular. Here two rules muſt be remembred and practiſed, one that Chriſt on the Croſs was thy pledg and ſurety in particular, that he ſtood there in the very room and place in which thou thy ſelf in thy own perſon thouldeſt have ſtood: That thy very perſonal and particular Sins were imputed and applied to him: That he

ſtood

stood guilty as a Malefactor for them, and suffered the very Pangs of Hell: And that his sufferings are as much in acceptation with God as if thou hadst born the curse of the Law in thy own person eternally. The holding and believiug of this point is the very foundation of Religion, as also of the Church of God, &c. The 2d. Rule is, that Christ Crucified is thine, being really given thee of God the Father; even as truly as Houses and Lands are given of Earthly Fathers to their Children: And hence it is that the benefits of Christ are before God ours indeed, for our justification and Salvation] and *Page* 630. [First of all, the serious consideration of this, that the very Son of God himself suffered all the pains and torments of Hell on the Cross for our Sins, is the proper and most effectual means to stir up our Hearts to a godly sorrow for them. And that this thing may come to pass, *every Man must be setled without doubt that he was the Man that Crucified Christ*; that he is to be blamed as well as *Judas*, *Herod*, *Pilate*, or the *Jews*, and that his Sins should be the Nails, the Spears and the Thorns that pierced him. When this meditation begins to take place, bitterness of Spirit with Wailing and Mourning takes place in like manner, *Zach* 12. 10. *And they shall look upon him whom they have pierced, and they shall lament for him, as one lamenteth for his only Son.* (What a Doctrin then is it that teacheth us, that none but they that know themselves to be Elect, should once accuse themselves of this, that their Sins did Crucifie Christ?) *Peter* in his first Sermon struck the *Jews* as with a Thunderclap from Heaven, when he said unto them, ye have Crucified the Lord of glory: So that at

the same time 3000 Men were pricked in their Hearts and said *Act.* 2. 37. *Men and Brethren what shall we do to be saved?* Again, if Christ for our Sins shed his Heart Blood, and if our Sins made him sweat water and Blood, O then why should not we our selves shed bitter tears, and why should not our Hearts bleed for them? He that finds himself so dull and hardened that the Passion of Christ doth not humble him, is in a lamentable ease, for there is no Faith in the Death of Christ effectual in him as yet. (These words shew that *Perkins* speaks not this only to believers.) 2. The meditation of the passion of Christ is a most notable means to breed repentance and reformation of Life in time to come. For when we begin to think that Christ Crucified, by suffering the first and 2d. Death hath procured to us remission of all our Sins past, and freed us from Hell, Death and damnation; then if there be but a spark of Grace in us we begin to be of another mind, and to reason thus with our selves, what? hath the Lord been thus merciful to me that am of my self but a firebrand of Hell, as to free me from deserved destruction, and to receive me to favour in Christ? Yea; no doubt he hath, His name be blessed therefore: I will not therefore Sin any more as I have done, but rather endeavour hereafter to keep my self from every evil way.] 3. The right knowledg of our selves ariseth from the knowledg of Christ Crucified in whom, and by whom we come to know five special things of our selves. The first, how grievous our Sins are, and therefore how miserable we are in regard of them. If we consider our offences in themselves and as they are in us,

we may soon be deceived, &c. But if Sin be considered in the Death and passion of Christ whereof it was the cause, and the vileness thereof measured by the unspeakable torments endured by the Son of God; and if the greatness of the offence of Man be esteemed by the endless satisfaction made to the justice of God; the least Sin that is, will appear to be a Sin indeed, and that most grievous and ugly. Therefore Christ Crucified must be used by us as a mirror or Looking-Glass in which we may fully take a view of our wretchedness, &c. And before [and for our Neighbors, those specially that are of Christs Church, they are to be known of us on this manner: When we are to do any duty to them, we must not barely respect their Persons, but Christ Crucified in them, and them in Christ.] And *Page* 631.] The 5th. point is that we owe to Christ an endless debt, for he was Crucified only as our surety and pledg; and in that Spectacle of his passion we must consider our selves as the chief debtors; and that the very discharge of our debt, that is, the Sins which are inherent in us, were the proper cause of all the endless pains and torments that Christ endured, that he might set us most miserable Bankrupts at liberty from Hell, Death and damnation. For this his unspeakable goodness, if we do but once think of it seriously, we must needs confess that we owe our selves our Souls and Bodies and all that we have as a debt due unto him. And so soon as any Man begins to know Christ Crucified, he knows his own debt and thinks of the payment of it.] And that you may be sure that *Perkins* speaks not only of the Elect, see *Page* 631. *Col.* 2. [The

common Protestant likewise cometh short herein for 3 Causes. 1. Whereas in word they acknowledg him to be their Saviour (this he blameth not in them) that hath redeemed them from their evil Conversation, yet indeed they make him a patron of their Sins. The Thief makes him the receiver: The Murderer makes him his refuge, The Adulterer (be it spoken with reverence to his Majesty) makes him the Bawd, &c. Thus Christ that came to abolish Sin is made a maintainer thereof, and the common Packhorse of the World to bear every Mans burden. 2. Men are content to take knowledg of the merit of Christs passion, for the remission of their Sins, but in the mean season, the virtue of Christs Death for the mortifying of Sin, is little regarded, &c. 3. Men usually content themselves generally and confusedly to know Christ to be their Redeemer (it seems then, that it is true) never once seeking in every particular Estate and condition of Life, and in every particular blessing of God to feel the benefit of his passion. What is the cause that almost all the World live in security never almost touched for their horrible Sins? Surely the reason is because they did never yet seriously consider that Christ in the Garden lay grouling upon the Earth, sweating Water and Blood *for their* offences. (Can a Man speak plainer for Christs dying for all?) Again *all such* as by fraud and oppression or any kind of hard dealing suck the Blood of poor Men, never yet knew that *their Sins* drew out the Heart Blood of Christ! And proud Men and Women that are puffed up by reason of their attire, which is the badg of their shame, and never cease hunting after

ter ſtrange faſhions, conſider not that Chriſt was not Crucified in gay attire, but naked, that he might bear the whole ſhame and curſe of the Law for us. Theſe and ſuch like, whatſoever they ſay in word, are flat Enemies of the Croſs of Chriſt, and tread his precious Blood under their Feet. Now then conſidering this ſo weighty and ſpecial a point of Religion is ſo much neglected, O Man or Woman, high or low, young or old, if thou have been wanting this way begin for very ſhame to learn, and learning to know Chriſt Crucified: That thou mayeſt attain to this, behold him often, &c. 1. Look on him as a glaſs or ſpectacle in which thou ſhalt ſee Gods Glory greater in thy Redemption then in thy Creation. &c. 2. Thou muſt behold him as the full price of thy Redemption and perfect Reconciliation with God: And pray earneſtly to God that he would Seal up the ſame in thy conſcience by his Spirit. 3. Thou muſt behold Chriſt as an example to whom thou muſt conform thy ſelf by Regeneration, &c. Read the Hiſtory of Chriſts paſſion: Obſerve all the parts and circumſtances thereof, and apply them to thy ſelf for thy full Converſion. When thou readeſt that Chriſt went to the Garden as his cuſtom was where the Jews might ſoon attack him, conſider that he went to the death of the Croſs *for thy Sins* willingly, and not of conſtraint and that therefore thou for thy part ſhouldeſt do him all ſervice freely, *Pſal.* 110. 3. When thou heareſt that in his agony his Soul was heavy unto death, know it *was for thy Sins*; and thou ſhouldeſt much more conceive heavineſs of Heart for the ſame: Again that this ſorrow of his is joy and rejoycing to thee

if

if thou wilt believe in him; When thou readest that in the Garden he prayed lying grovling on his Face, sweating Water and Blood, begin to think seriously, what an unspeakable measure of Gods wrath was upon thy blessed Saviour, that did prostrate his Body upon the Earth, and cause the Blood to follow; and think that *thy Sins* must needs be most hainous that brought such bloody and grievous pains upon him. Also think it is a shame for thee to carry thy Head to Heaven with haughty looks, to wallow in thy pleasures, and to draw the innocent Blood of thy poor brethren by oppression and deceit, for whom, Christ Sweat Water and Blood; and take an occasion from Christs agony to lay aside the pride of thy Heart, yea, even to bleed for thy own offences, *&c.* When thou readest that Christ was taken and bound, think that *thy very Sins* brought him into the power of his Enemies, and were the very bonds wherewith he was tied: Think, that thou shouldst have been bound in the very same manner unless he had been a surety and pledg for thee: Think also that thou in the same manner art bound and tied with the Chains of thy own Sins, *&c.* Lastly think and believe that the bonds of Christ serve to purchase thy liberty from Hell, death and damnation. When thou heareſt that he was brought before *Annas* and *Caiphas*, think, it was meet that *thy surety* and pledg who was to suffer the Condemnation due to thee should by the High Priest as by the Mouth of God, be condemned: And wonder at this that the very Coessential, and Eternal Son of God, even the Soveraign judg of the World, stands to be judged, and that by wicked Men, perswading

ing thy self that this so great confusion comes of thy Sins: Whereupon being further amazed at thy fearful state, humble thy self in dust and ashes, and pray God to soften thy stony Heart, that thou maist turn to him, and by true Faith lay hold on Christ, &c. When thou readest that *Barrabas*, the murderer was preferred before Christ &c *Thy very Sins* pulled on him that shameful reproach: and in that for *thy cause* he was esteemed worse than *Barrabas*, &c. When thou readest that he was openly and judicially condemned to the curs-ed death of the Cross, consider what is the wrath and fury of God against Sin, and how great is his mercy to Sinners; and in this Spectacle *look on thy self* and with groans of Heart say, O good God, what settest thou before mine Eyes, *I even I have sinned*, *I am guilty* and worthy of damnation! Whence comes this change that thy blessed Son *is in my room* but of thy unspeakable mercy! Wretch that I am? How have I forgotten my self and thee my God: O Son of God how low hast thou abased thy self *for me*! Therefore give me grace O God that beholding my own Estate in the person of my Saviour, thus condemned, I may detest my Sins that were the cause thereof and by a lively Faith embrace that absolution which thou offerest me in him who was condemned *in my stead* and room. O Lord Jesus, Saviour of the World give me that Holy Spirit, that I may judg my self and be as vile in my own Eyes as thou wast vile before the *Jews*: Unite me unto thee by the same Spirit, that in thee I may be as worthy to be accepted before God, as I am worthy in my self to be detested for my Sins, &c. When thou readest that he was stript of his

cloathing, think, it was that he being naked might bear thy shame on the Cross, &c. When thou readest of the complaint of Christ that he was forsaken of his Father, consider how he suffered the pangs and torments of Hell *as thy Pledge and Surety*, &c. When thou readest of his Death consider that thy Sins were the cause of it, &c.

Thus far Mr. *Perkins*, whose words I have thus largely set doown, both as a pattern for Ministers how to Preach the Doctrine of Redemption, and to shew the necessity there is that Ministers and People do see (and discover to others) their Sin in this great aggravation, [as they were the crucifiers of Christ] and to shew you what English Ministers Preach to the People whatever they speak in Disputes; and what kind of Preaching it is which hath succeeded so in *England* for the conversion of Souls! If this be not a plain Preaching of Universal Redemption or Satisfaction, as to all that hear the Gospel (whom he requires so oft to consider that *Their* sins crucified Christ) then I know not what is. And if any quirke may be produced to wrest so plain words to a contrary sense; I am sure the poor sinners to whom it is Preached know not ordinarily those evasions, but receive it in the plain sense. I could fill a Volume with the like passages as this, out of our most powerful and successful Preachers.

Here then are two distinct aggravations of sin, both necessarr to every penitent Soul, both which are denyed by the denyal of Universal satisfaction; The first is that our sins killed Christ as being the cause of his Death. Is not a man bound to mourn over him whom his sins have pierced before

before he knoweth himself to be Elect? How few then of the Elect themselves should do it? 2. The second aggravation is that all our sins against recovering mercies, are committed against him that Died for us: He that denyeth both these aggravations of sin doth not a little wrong Christ and mens Souls.

Lastly, I argue thus; If without those forementioned aggravations of sin, no man can truly and savingly Repent, then all men are bound thus to aggravate their sins (in their self accusations.) But without these there can be no saving Repentance, *Ergo*, &c.

The consequence of the *Major* is proved, in that all men are bound truly to Repentance, even with that which is called Repentance unto Life.

The Antecedent or *Minor* is proved.

1. In that else it can be but a Legal Repentance and not an Evangelical if it be not for sin as the crucifier of Christ, and for sin as against our Redeemer.

2. From the description of true Gospel Repentance, *Zech.* 12. 10. *They shall look on him whom they have pierced, and mourn over him*, &c. Or if it were proved that there is besides this a true Repentance foregoing, yet it is but part of that great work, seeing this Evangelical Repentance must go close with it. And if any say tha tmen are bound first to believe before they arebound to this evangelical repentance for sinning against the blood of Christ. Ianswer. 1. They are bound to both at once; and the Apostles prest both at once on men, *To Repent and Believe*. 2. Most Divines make Repentance with Faith to go before Justification

fication. 3. Some have writ whole Volumes to prove that it goes before Faith it self. 4. All acknowledge that it goes before assurance or knowledge of our Election. And if Christ died only for the Elect, then no man could repent of his sins as that which killed Christ, or as against his blood, till he first knew himself to be Elect, and then many true Christians should never so repent in this Life, and always the Gospel Repentance would not only follow Justification, but even the knowledge of Justificaton: Whereas *Amesius* and most of ours do make it with Faith, go before both Justification and Sanctification.

Argum. 17th. *A novo jure Dominii & imperii.*

If Christ have a new Dominion and Empire over all men, grounded (*quoad meritum*) on his redeeming of all, (or satisfying for all,) then he did Redeem (or make satisfaction for) all: But the Antecedent is true, *Ergo*, &c.

I might have used these as two distin & Mediums; but for brevity I will conjoin them, and argue specially a *jure imperii*, which in order of Nature followeth the *jus Dominii*, and is grounded on it: Man being made a rational Creature, there was a necessity he should have a Government Moral according to his Nature; and God being his Lord and Owner it was therefore necessary that he should be his Supream Rector: For the right of disposure belongs to him that is absolute Owner, or full Propietary: And Regiment is part of the disposure of the reasonable Creature

Creature. So then the *necessitas regiminis passivè considerati*, is founded in the Nature of Man; but the *jus imperii* is founded in the *jure Dominii* (in our present case.) So that where ever God hath as Redeemer the *jus imperii*, it is necessary *necessitate consequente & Consequentiæ*, that he have the *jus dominii*: And wherever he hath the *jus dominii*, it is necessary *necessitate Antecedente & consequentiæ* that he have the *jus imperii*; if so be that the Creature be capable of Government Moral, else not; for the *jus* supposeth that capacity. And therefore Christs Dominion is larger than his Empire. I still here take the term [*Dominium*] in the strict sense, as it signifieth meer Propriety, and not in the large sense as it comprehendeth both Propriety and Empire, as its parts. As Gods Rectorship is founded in his Propriety, so his Legislation presupposeth his Rectorship: So that in natural order he is first *Dominus Absolutus* and then secondly, *Rector Supremus*; and then *ex jure imperii*, he is *Legislator*. Now God at first was owner of the World as Creator, and thence had a right to Govern the World as Creator; and thence made them that perfect Law fitted to the state of a perfect Creature, and expressing the perfection of the Creator, Ruler and Law-maker. Upon the breach of this Law, and the ruin of the World thereby, the maker becomes the repairer; Christ redeemeth the World: And hereby hath first a *novum jus Dominii*, a new Propriety in it. 2. *A novum jus imperii*, a new right to Govern it. 3. And hence he is *novus Legislator*, he doth make new Laws, even the Laws of Grace and Faith. Now as Gods Creation of all was the ground of his right of Governing of all

and

and that Right was the ground of his actual Government of all. So Christs redeeming of all is the ground of his new Right to Govern all, and that Right is the ground of his actual Government. And as God had not a propriety in one Man, or a Right to govern him, because he made another Man, but because he made that Man, so Christ hath not his new propriety in Reprobates or his new Right to govern them, meerly from his redeeming other Men, *viz.* The Elect, but from his redeeming all Men, and them among the rest: And as God had his *jus imperii* by Creation over the Rebellions as well as the obedient (for God lost not his right when *Adam* did Rebel) so hath Christ by Redemption his *jus imperii* over Unbelievers, as well as over the faithful. And as, if God had let the World go on, under the meer Regiment of the Law of Creation, it would not follow that God would certainly save all Men, because he made all (for then the Devils would be saved, and none could be damned) so under the Administration of Christ according to the Law of Redemption, it will no more follow, that Christ will save all, because he redeemed all. For Gods Creation had gracious or favourable ends for the Creature, as well as his Redemption: And he might as truly be said to create them to Life, as to Redeem them to Life: Nay, he gave all Men in our first Parents actual possession of Paradise, of Righteousness and Holiness and the favour of God, which is Mans happiness, and yet he permitted them to lose it: So Redemrtion obligeth not the Redeemer to save all the redeemed: nor doth necessarily infer their future Salvation. Yet here

is

is no ground for that charge which is laid on the *Arminians*, to be laid on this Doctrin, *viz.* that then Christs Blood might be lost; for Gods decrees will see to that. Gods foreknowledg determinates the Salvation of the Elect, infallibly certain: His decree of Predestination makes their Salvation future: Redemption is a part of the execution of that Decree; and it is (as Creation was) not a part peculiar to the Elect, and inseparable from Salvation, but a general part, common to all, and laying the necessary groundwork for the more special parts of execution.

And therefore when the Apostle saith [whom he foreknew them he did Predestinate to be conformed, *&c. And whom he did Predestinate, them he called; whom he called, them he justified: And whom he justified, them he Glorified, Rom.* 8. 30.] he never saith, [whom he died for, or whom he redeemed them he called. or justified or glorified] no more then [whom he Created] so that Redemption as presupposing the Predetermination of Election is an infallible means of attaining the Salvation of the redeemed that were so Elect; the infallibility and futurition being not properly from Redemption as such, but from Predestination and foreknowledg, and so from Redemption as joyned thereto; (that is, from Gods Intention, or purpose *de hoc eventu.*) But Redemption doth not presuppose all the redeemed to be Elect by decree, and therefore doth not necessarily infer the Salvation of all the redeemed. They do therefore sorely mistake that suppose Redemption hath this for its direct end, *viz.* The Salvation of the redeemed; or that it is its end at all, that all the redeemed shall be infallibly, eventually saved:

But

But Redemption layeth first the ground of Christs new Empire, and Administration to all the World: Upon this groundwork is the whole Government of the World built, and all the Judicial proceeding, and execution at the last day: And therefore they that deny Universal Redemption know not what they do: They deny the Foundation of Gods Dominion as Redeemer, and of his new Empire, and Legislation, and Judgment. Redemption now, is necessarily Antecedent to the Condemnation of perishing Unbelievers, as well as causal of the Salvation of Believers.

Obj. *Then it may be said, that Christ Redeemed Unbelievers to the day of evil; for it is said God made the wicked Man for the Day of evil, Prov.* 16. 4.

Ans. In the same Sence as one is spoken, the other may be spoken truly: For if it be spoken of Gods Legislative Will, or legal ordination, then as it is true that [God by his Law hath made the day of evil, that is, of punishment, for wicked Men] or that [God when he had Created Man, ordained by his Law that the wicked should be punished] so the same may be said of the Redeemed [When he had Redeemed all Men, he ordained that all that reject so great Salvation shall undergo a far sorer punishment] or if the meaning be of Gods Decretive will *de eventu* [God when he made Man, did intend to destroy the Non-Elect for their wickedness]: so it is as true of Redeemed ones [God Redeemer when he Redeemed Man, did intend

to

to destroy the Non-Elect for their rejecting of his mercy] But as it is not the meaning of the Text, that [Mens damnation was Gods end in creating them] (as *Twiss* hath fully proved) so is it not true, that Mens damnation was Christs end in Redeeming. It is no effect therefore of Redemption, but an accidental consequent: And therefore Christ saith he came not into the World to condemn the World, but that the World though him might be saved: that is, the Salvation of all was, 1. The end of Christs Legislative will, that is, the end propounded to Man, 2. And Redemption hath the nature of a means (sufficient in *suo genere*) for all Mens Salvation, and so God might be said, not to Create the World that he might condemn it, but that the World through him might be saved: Though yet eventually they are not saved: Christ intended in suffering for Mans Sin, that his satisfaction should remove that great impediment of their Salvation, *viz.* The dissatisfaction of the offended Creator, as he was Rector according to the first Law: And that it should be the ground of his New Law whereby he gives freely Remission and Salvation to all Men, on condition they will accept himself and his benefits with him. So that as it would be intollerable delusion of Mens Souls, for any Preacher to tell Men, that all that are Created shall be saved, so is it to tell them that are Redeemed (as to the price and satisfaction made) shall be saved: For then when they find in Scripture that Christ died for all, and is a propitiation for the Sins of the whole World, they will conclude that they shall certainly be saved.

This

Thus much I thought meet to say for the ground work of my Argumentation, by way of explication; because I find that Truth is sometimes better let in by the clear unfolding of it, then driven in by force of arguing.

To proceed to the Argument; It must be understood that we speak not here of the old right of Dominion and Government, which Christ as God Creator and one with the Father, had before the Sin of Man; And then that which I have to prove is 1. That Christ hath a new right of Dominion and Government, and that over all Men whatsoever. 2. Yet this right is founded in his work of redemption, and the Fathers delivering all to him as in the relation of Redeemer. 3. That his right to Dominion and rule over all, is not meerly from Redemption of the Elect, but of all. even of each person to whom he hath this right.

As for the first, I hope few Christians will deny it, if any do I prove it thus. 1. If Christ have not as Redeemer a right to govern all, then he may not make Universal Laws for the Government of all, But Christ hath made such Universal Laws, *Ergo*, *&c.* His Laws command all Men every where to repent, and all that hear the Gospel to believe: And promise and threaten accordingly.

Obj. *The* Indians *never heard his Laws.*

Ans. 1. That restriction is *ex parte promulgantis* for want of publication, but not *ex parte legem ferentis* for want of Enacting a Universal Law; The Law excludes none in the tenor of it but commands

commands all to believe without exception. 2. The Officers or Heralds of Christ have authority to publish it to all the World. 3. Christ hath more Laws then the written or published Gospel in fulness. The dispensation of all things by, providential disposal, are Christs Law, that is, they are the signs and discoveries of mercy and Mans duty: They shew the World 1. That they are not left under that helpless, remedilesse case that they were in by the desert of their own Sin: For the rigid Law of works never allowed to them that had violated it, and were cursed by it, so great mercies as all Men now enjoy, and daily find flowing in upon them *à Deo Misericorde*, and that to such ends as their repentance and recovery. 2. These mercies and other works of Christ, do shew the World the duty of repenting: *Paul* saith that the mercies of God lead them to repentance. Now repentance is not here taken for hellish despairing repentance, as the Text plainly shews: But for that which hath a tendency to recovery, and is joyned with such a hope as excludeth utter despair, and may encourage to the use of means as means and that which thus revealeth Christs mercy and Mans duty and means, is sure Christs Law.

2. *Arg.* If Christ as Redeemer hath not a right to Govern all Men, then he may not command his Messengers to go into all the World and preach the Gospel to every Creature: But he hath so commanded them, *Mat.* 16.15,16. Where Christ hath not Authority to Rule, there he hath not Authority to bid his Messenger Rule under him, or publish his Laws, or command Men to obey him.

3. *Arg.* If Christ as Redeemer have not Authority to rule all to whom the Gospel comes, then all such are not bound to take him for their King and Lord; But all such are bound to take him as their King and Lord, *Ergo*, &c. (4.) If Christ as Redeemer have not right of governing all that hear the Gospel, then there are no Rebels (for Rebellion is only against a rightful Power) nor do they Sin in actual disobeying him when he commands as Redeemer. But the consequents are wicked and intollerable, *Ergo*, &c. *Luke* 19. 27. *Those mine Enemies that would not I should Reign over them, bring hither and slay them before me.* (5.) If Christ have not this right over all the World then all the World is not guilty of Sinning against him; But all the World is guilty of Sinning against the Redeemers Laws, *Ergo*, &c. They Sin against those mercies which lead to repentance (6.) A multitude of plain Texts prove Christs Universal Dominion and Empire. *Mat.* 28.19. All power is given to me in Heaven and Earth, *Joh.* 13. 3. All things are delivered unto him of the Father: delivered into his Hand, *Joh.* 5. 22. *The Father judgeth no Man; but hath given all judgment to the Son*, &c. *Phil.* 2. 7. 8. 9. *Rom.* 14. 9.

2. That this Right is founded on Redemption, is proved by all that is said in the forementioned Arguments and Texts; and I think few Christians will deny it, *Rom.* 14. 9. *For this end he both died, rose and revived, that he might be Lord, of the dead and of the living.* If it were the end of his death and resurrection to obtain this Dominion, then surely this Dominion is ground-

ed

ed in that Death and Resurrection, and belongs to him as a Redeemer, *Phil.* 2. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. he became obedient to Death, even the Death of the Cross: Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, *&c.*

3. And that it is not Christs dying only for the Elect that is the ground of his Dominion and Empire over all, I prove thus. 1. The Dominion of Christ and his *Jus Imperii* over the Non-Elect is of the same kind with his Dominion and *Jus Imperii* over the Elect, and therefore hath the same cause. It is not such as his Dominion over Devils or Brutes, as we shall further shew anon. I say not that Christ exerciseth his Imperial power in the same way over all, but the relation of *Rex* or *Imperator* which Christ hath rightfully over all, is the same to all: And the relation of Subjects to Christ, which all stand in to him *quoad debitum vel jus*, is the same relation; all Men as well as the Elect, to whom his Laws are promulgate, are bound to acknowledg him their King and Lord in the same sence as the Elect are: And are bound to give up themselves to him as his subjects in the same sense as the Elect are, and with a subjection of the same kind: For the New Law which constituteth the duty, is general, and distinguisheth not, as to this, between Elect and Non-Elect. 2. It is manifest that Christs Blood cannot be *purchasing* of Dominion or *Empire* immediately, but only *mediante virtute satisfactoria*, as it is a placament or propitiatory Sacrifice to the offended Majesty; For were not Christs Blood first necessary to this expiatory use, it would be so far from being purchasing or meritorious of any further benefit,

that it would not be acceptable to God at all: For he is not bloodthirsty, he takes not pleasure in the Blood of the innocent, Nay, he is averse from it. So that Christs Death must needs be first satisfactory to Justice in order of nature, before it purchase Dominion or *Empire*. Now if he may have this right to a peculiar Dominion and *Empire* over most of the World without satisfying for them, then either his right over most is immediate without flowing from satisfaction (which is evidently false) or else it is founded in his satisfaction for others, *viz.* the Elect: And if so then why might not he as well have right of Dominion and Empire over the Elect without satisfying for them, as over all others without satisfying for them? And if so, then he might do all that which now he doth as Lord and Rector, without satisfaction Antecedent. And if so, then he might make his New Law which now he hath made, wherein he Repeals the bondage of Ceremonies and provideth a remedy against the curse, and whereby he gives pardon, and glory to all if they will receive him; But this may not be granted.

3. It is also proved hence, that Christs rule over all Men is founded in his satisfaction of Redeeming of those same Men; because when he is offered to them and they commanded to receive him, it is in the Relation of Lord Redeemer: All are commanded to take him for their Lord Jesus Christ, no Man is commanded to take him as Lord and King only, and not as Redeemer and Saviour: Nay, our Divines commonly make the act of justifying Faith to consist only in receiving Christ as Redeemer or satisfier,

or

or Saviour, as saving us by his Blood from guilt; excluding the reception of him as King and Lord from being the justifying Act of Faith (wherein yet I am forced as zealouly to contradict them as in almost any one point) only they confess it is of absolute necessity that Christ at the same time be received as Lord, when he is received as Redeemer. Now all Men are bound (that hear the Gospel) to believe to justification, that's generally granted: And if so. then all Men are bound to receive Christ as their Lord-Redeemer, and not as Lord to them andRedeemer to others: And if so, then doubtless Christ is their Lord-Redeemer. Now Redemption hath two parts, the first is the paying of the Price that is, satisfaction by dying for us: The 2d. is, applying or conferring the benefits of that satisfaction, by actual delivering or Redeeming from the guilt and power of Sin: The first is that chief part of Redemption from whence the whole is chiefly denominated. Now the first part is past and done whether Men believe or not and is not offered to be done on any condition, nor to be done for our Sins: Christ doth not say, I will pay the price of thy Redemption, if thou wilt take me for thy Redeemer, it is paid already, but it is the 2d. part of Redemption that is offered on condition. The first is general and absolure: The second is generally given on condition; and special as to the actual Collation by Christ and fruition by Man. So that when Christ saith to a Man, [take me for thy Redeemer] it is as much as to say, [take me for one that hath made satisfaction for thy Sins and if thou wilt receive me I will pardon and save

thee thereby] now if Christ did not Redeem Men, by satisfying, and yet require them to take him as their Redeemer, then he requires them to take him to be that which he is not, and to have done that which he hath not: For Christ cannot be a Redeemer to any Man that he hath not paid the paid the price of Redemption for: Which if it be not done, Faith will not cause it to be done, So that it being certain, that the Lordship and Empire of Christ which he hath right to over all, and which all are commanded to acknowledg and submit to, is inseparably conjoyned with his Redemption, he being offered to no Man as Lord, to whom he is not also offerd as Redeemer, it is evident that his *Jus novum Dominij & imperiii*, his new right of propriety and Rule over all Men, doth presuppose his Redeeming all, as to the price and satisfaction.

Obj. *But if that be so, then he Redeemed or died for Bruits, Devils and good Angels: For he hath a Right of Dominion and Rule over these.*

Ans. This Objection, though otherwise scarce worthy to be taken notice of, hath been so entertained, yielded to and confidently managed by some, that it is become necessary to make a discovery of its vanity. 1. Christ hath not a proper Empire or Rectorship over Bruits: For they are not capable of being Subjects of a Kingdom. 2. His Dominion over them is but as they are subservient to his ends for Man, and as they are Mans Servants and Utensils. 3. Christ hath not (that I can find in Scripture) any *novum jus Dominii*, any new propriety as Redeemer, in Devils or in good Angels: But having an ancient

ent propriety in them as being their Creator he useth them accordingly for his Redemption ends. 4. Nor do I find that he hath purchased any new proper absolute *jus imperii* or Rectorship over them, but only a power of using them for his Church, and for service about Man he shall send them on. 5. And therefore I say, the Empire of Christ over Angels is not of the same kind with that which he hath over Men, and which we use in the Argument to prove that he died for Men. If both should be called by the same title of a *novum jus imperii*, yet the difference of the Subjects sufficeth to shew the different Sence of the same attribute as severally applied: I find not that Christ any where proclains himself the King of Devils or Angels, nor requires them to take him for their King, nor hath made any new Laws to govern them by, as he hath done for Men, nor hath restored any forfeited mercy to them, nor offers them pardon of any Sin upon condition of repentance, nor will judg them on such terms. So that if it should be proved that the good Angels are part of his Kingdom as Redeemer, yet it would be but as their confirmer, and not as a Redeemer of them: For he is never offered to them as a Redeemer, nor did they need any, for ought I know: He took not on him the nature of Angels, but of the Seed of *Abraham*. He is Head over all things, to his Church, *Eph.* 1, 22. That is, He is superior to Angels and all things, and hath the disposal of them for his Churches use, but he is only Head of his Church *de facto* as to proper Kingly Rule, and of the rest of the World *de jure* who shall suffer as Rebels for not acknowledging his Title, and be-

cause they would not that he should reign over them, *Luke* 39. 27. But so shall not Bruits or Devils; So that the Argument will hold good *à jure novo Dominii & Imperii*, from Christs new propriety in and Rectorship over Men to his Redeeming them by his Blood: But so it will not from that kind of Dominion which Christ hath over Bruits, or that kind of Rule that he hath over Angels or Devils, to his Redemption of them; And yet for Bruits, as they suffered for the sake of Man, and as they shall be restored from their suffering for the use and sake of Man, so the same Blood which purchased Mans Restoration, did remotely and collaterally purchase theirs. Let us illustrate all by a similitude, as near resembling the present case as we can imagine; Suppose when King *James* Raigned in *England*, that *Ireland* had all fallen into Rebellion, and so open, bloody and malicious that the King were resolved not a Man of them should be pardoned or escape: Hereupon in the height of their malice, they entice all *Scotland* into Rebellion also: But because they are but deluded into it by the Jesuits, and not maliciously bent against him as they, or because being his Countrymen by birth, should repent as them, it is compacted between him and his only Son, that his Son shall pay their ransom, or by some publick Sacrifice, shall make that Law [illegible] as the Law, and that Redemption to [illegible] any shall [illegible] all others [illegible] and especially to his following shall [illegible] [illegible] for the glory of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

it as his further business, to use means for the bringing them all back to their allegiance: To which end the whole Kingdom of *Scotland*, is given up to him as King upon his satisfaction and Ransome, and he is to make a General pardon or Act of Oblivion to all, so be it they do by such a day come in and lay down Arms and return to their Allegiance, and acknowledg the Kings Grace, and the Princes singular favour in Ransoming them, and will take him for their King upon this Ransome: And for those that will not accept this offer, the Prince is to subdue them by force and destroy them, that they shall have no benefit of the Ransome; And for all the *Irish* which he finds among them, seducing them, he is to destroy them, or use them to what servitude in the mean time he please: Also he is to make use of any of the Kings Servants or Subjects of *England*, to send on his Message to summon them to come in. Now I demand. 1. Hath not the Prince here Ransomed all the *Scots* over whom he hath his *Jus Dominii & Imperii*? That is absolutely all? 2. Doth it follow that therefore he hath Ransomed the *Irish*, because he hath power to judg and destroy them, or use them in servitude? 3. Or doth it follow that he hath Ransomed the Town, Boats, and Lands of the Country, because he hath a propriety in them as the Goods or Utensils of them whom he Ransomed. 4. Or did he Ransome any of the Kings Servants or *English*, because he hath power to send them on his message or command them on his Service into *Scotland*? If any argue thus with a *Scot* (the Prince hath a new Title of Dominion and Empire over all you Scottish as ransomed, there-

fore

he ransomed you all] this is no unsound arguing: And would you confute it by saying that [then he ransomed the *English* and *Irish* too, yea the Lands, and Trees, and Beasts] By the *Scots* I mean, mankind, By the *Irish*, the Devils, by the Kings Servants, or *English*, the Angels: And by the Lands, Trees, &c. I mean all the creatures on Earth as Servants of Man.

A Man would think that those Men that do so vehemently contend that Christ is the Head of the visible Church, and the King of this visible Kingdom which comprehendeth good and bad, should easily yield to this Argument.

If Christ be the Head or King of all the visible Church, and consequently of more than the Elect, then did he die for the visible Church, and so for more than the Elect: But the Antecedent is maintained stifly by themselves, *Ergo*, &c.

When they have voluminously pleaded for the Honours and Priviledges of the Church visible, *viz.* That even the unregenerate part of it are Disciples, Christians, Saints, Believers, Adopted, in Covenant, &c. And that Christ is their Master, King and Head, will they say that yet for all this Christ did not die for them? Why hereby they incur these intollerable inconveniences. 1. That such excellent gifts and Gospel Priviledges should flow from any other fountain than the Death of Christ, and that Men should have so great mercies, for whom he never died (of which before 2. That Christs Office should be so divided, as that he should be their King and Head for whom he never died: It is their use to argue on the Contrary that Christ died not for Men whom he doth not sanctifie and save, because

cause the parts of his work are not divided: Though this be no better arguing then to say, God created no Angel or Man, putting them under a Covenant, and in a way of Life, but only those that attain to Life hereby: Yet it is an undeniable consequence on the other side, that Christ died for Men because they receive such Priviledges and benefits and because he is become their Head or King, even as it follows that God Created *Adam* to Life by that Covenant, if he had attained Life thereby.

And it is not inconsiderable how they lay themselves open to the Lashes of one another by their error in this point; When those that are for Discipline have pleaded the *Jus Divinum* of their work, as from Christ as the King or Head of the Church visible, the *Erastians* tell them that Christ is not King where he is not Priest; he is not the King of any but the Elect, or Saints because he died for none but the Elect, See what *Ludovicus Molinæus* (who would unite the *Erastians* and Indepedents against the Presbyterians) saith *Paranes. Page* 68. *Etenim primum dubitari potest an Christus qua Caput & Rex Electorum seu Corporis mystici, qualis hic in foro interno describitur, rectè statuatur in alio foro, eoque externo potestatem legislationis & jurisdictionis committere personis circares & causas, quarum judicium & cognitio, non sub est judicio & Cognitioni illius, qui sumus est judex in foro externo.* This Book is newly Printed many Years since this Disputation was written, though I here insert this passage.

Ad hominem, I am sure this Argument is not contemptible: There is no Evasion but by saying that Christ is not the King or Head of the unre-

he ransomed you all] this is no unsound arguing: And would you confute it by saying that [then he ransomed the *English* and *Irish* too, yea the Lands, and Trees, and Beasts] By the *Scots* I mean, mankind, By the *Irish*, the Devils, by the Kings Servants, or *English*, the Angels: And by the Lands, Trees, *&c.* I mean all the creatures on Earth as Servants of Man.

A Man would think that those Men that do so vehemently contend that Christ is the Head of the visible Church, and the King of this visible Kingdom which comprehendeth good and bad, should easily yield to this Argument.

If Christ be the Head or King of all the visible Church, and consequently of more than the Elect, then did he die for the visible Church, and so for more than the Elect: But the Antecedent is maintained stifly by themselves, *Ergo*, *&c.*

When they have voluminously pleaded for the Honours and Priviledges of the Church visible, *viz.* That even the unregenerate part of it are Disciples, Christians, Saints, Believers, Adopted, in Covenant, *&c.* And that Christ is their Master, King and Head, will they say that yet for all this Christ did not die for them? Why hereby they incur these intollerable inconveniences. 1. That such excellent gifts and Gospel Priviledges should flow from any other fountain than the Death of Christ, and that Men should have so great mercies, for whom he never died (of which before 2. That Christs Office should be so divided, as that he should be their King and Head for whom he never died: It is their use to argue on the Contrary that Christ died not for Men whom he doth not sanctifie and save, because

cause the parts of his work are not divided: Though this be no better arguing then to say, God created no Angel or Man, putting them under a Covenant, and in a way of Life, but only those that attain to Life hereby: Yet it is an undeniable consequence on the other side, that Christ died for Men because they receive such Priviledges and benefits and because he is become their Head or King, even as it follows that God Created *Adam* to Life by that Covenant, if he had attained Life thereby.

And it is not inconsiderable how they lay themselves open to the Lashes of one another by their error in this point; When those that are for Discipline have pleaded the *Jus Divinum* of their work, as from Christ as the King or Head of the Church visible, the *Erastians* tell them that Christ is not King where he is not Priest; he is not the King of any but the Elect, or Saints because he died for none but the Elect, See what *Ludovicus Molinaus* (who would unite the *Erastians* and Indepedents against the Presbyterians) saith *Paranes. Page* 68. *Etenim primum dubitari potest an Christus qua Caput & Rex Electorum seu Corporis mystici, qualis hic in foro interno describitur, rectè statuatur in alio foro, eoque externo potestatem legislationis & jurisdictionis committere personis circares & causas, quarum judicium & cognitio, non sub est judicio & Cognitioni illius, qui summus est judex in foro externo.* This Book is newly Printed many Years since this Disputation was written, though I here insert this passage.

Ad hominem, I am sure this Argument is not contemptible: There is no Evasion but by saying that Christ is not the King or Head of the unre-

unregenerate part of the Church visible, as he is mediator, but purely as God: But that's as destructive to their cause as if they denied him to be their King at all; For they will never evince that he taketh Men into the Gospel Covenant, and becomes their King and makes them Saints, Adopted, Christians, Believers, &c. and all this meerly as he is God and not as he is Mediator.

Arg. 18th. *A Beneficiis in omnes Collatis, quæ satisfactionis sunt effecta.*

If Christ give to all Men those mercies which are the effects of his dying for them, then Christ died (or satisfied) for all Men: But Christ doth give to all Men those mercies which are the effects of his dying for them, *Ergo*, &c.

The *Minor* only requires proof, and here I have these three things to prove. 1. That Christ giveth mercies to all. 2. That these mercies are the effects of his Death and satisfaction. 3. That they are the effects of his Death for those Men to whom they are given. For I look to meet with three sorts of opposers. 1. Such as say, wicked Men have no mercy (*viz.* The Non-Elect) for all is given them in judgment and wrath, and shall but aggravate their condemnation. 2. Such as say, They have mercies, but it is from Gods common providence, and not from Christs Blood. 3. Such as say, their mercies are from Christs Blood, but only as shed for the Elect, and not for them.

1. For the first, It is so openly blasphemous against God and his providence, for Men to say, that God is merciful to none but the Elect, that one would think no Christian should ever own such

such an Assertion. 1. If none but the Elect have any mercy from God, then none else are obliged by mercy to repentance: But the mercies of God lead others to repentance, *Rom.* 2. Even those that by hardheartedness and impenitency do heap up wrath against the day of wrath and Revelation of the righteous judgment of God. 2. Else none but the Elect should be obliged to love and thankfulness for mercy, which is false and wicked. 3. Else none but the Elect should be guilty of sinning against mercy, or should need to confess any such Sin, or need pardon of such, or can be accused, condemned or punished for any such, which are all false. 4. Their own words do confute themselves, for whereas they say, that Reprobates have no true mercy because all do but encrease their condemnation and misery; It is evident that if they were not real mercies, no Mans condemnation or punishment could be aggravated by the abuse or rejecting of mercy, *Job.* 4. 2. God had mercy on more *Ninevites* then were Elect, *Jon.* 3. 10. and 4. 11. Christ himself saith God *is kind to the unthankful and the Evil*, *Luk.* 6. 35. and commandeth us to imitate him in loving our Enemies and being merciful as he is merciful, *Psal.* 106. 7. *Psal.* 145. 9. His tender mercies are over all his Works, *Act.* 14. 17. *Mat.* 5. 45. 48. *Mat.* 25. throughout; sure those that deny the Non-Elect to partake of any mercy on Earth, think it no mercy to be out of Hell, to have Christ and pardon and glory given them, on condition of acceptance, they would hardly yield then that God is merciful to the very damned in Hell, and yet our own Divines and Papists say it is past doubt. See *Ursin Catech.* Page 68. *Edit. Parai posthum. & Robert. Baronius disput.*

disput. de peccat Mortali & Veniali Pag. 75. *Aquin.* 1. *q.* 32. *a.* 4. *c.* & 1. & 1. *q.* 21: *a.* 4. 1. *Scot.* in 4. *dist.* 46. Pag. (*mihi*) 250. *&c. Bradwardin, de causa Dei lib.* 1. *Cap.* 34. So *Cajetan, Lorinus, Paes, Feuerdentius Salmeron, Genebrard, &c.* (I say as *Jac. Laurentius* in *Jac.* 2. 12.) And our most judicious Brittish Divines in the *Synod* of *Dort* do well conclude, that Gods mercies must not be denied or accounted less because wicked Men yet perish through their abuse of them.

2. And that these mercies are the effects of Christs Blood and satisfaction, is proved thus. 1. Of some of them it is expressly affirmed, *Heb.* 10. 29. [hath counted the Blood of the Covenant wherewith he was sanctified an Unholy thing] 2. God cannot according to the tenor of the Covenant of Works (*voluntate saltem ordinata*) give Men so much mercy as they all receive: For that Covenant curseth them, and sentenceth them to Death, and leaveth no proper mercy, at least none that hath a conducibility to repentance and recovery: Dare any Man think that all the mercies temporal, and the offers of Christ and Grace, and the Word and other means, and the common gifts of the Spirit, and the conditional pardon of the Non-Elect, and the patience, and long-suffering of God inviting and beseeching them to be reconciled to him, promising them Life and Glory if they will believe, that all these are given according to the Law of Works? If not, then it must be according to the Law of Grace and the New Covenant, or according to no Law. If the former, then none will question, I think, but it must come from Christs Blood: For the New Law and Testament is founded in his Blood, and

and Sealed by it: If the later, then at least the Law of Works must be first relaxed, and they so far pardoned, seeing according to that Law they should have lived, not among these mercies, but in misery: And Scripture assures us, that it was the Blood of Christ that delivered us from the Curse of the Law, and that on the Cross he took down the hand writing that was against us, &c. And without his suffering there is no Relaxation of the Laws obligation. They that set open so wide a door of mercy to all the World beside Jesus Christ, do not lightly wrong him and do dangerously deceive themselves and others: I am sure Christ will expect repentance, thanks and obedience for these mercies, and condemn Men for not improving these Talents which he committed to them; however Men may now tell Sinners that all comes but from common providence and not by the Blood of Christ. 3. Yea, that which they call common providence is the disposal of things by the Redeemer: For all things are delivered to him of the Father, and all power given him and to that end he died, rose and revived that he might be Lord of the Dead and Living: And therefore if Men have any mercy now, it must come through the Redeemers Hands, and consequently is a fruit of his Blood. But this will yet further be proved in the next which is.

3. That it is Christs dying for those same persons to whom he gives these mercies, that is the ground of them: And this further is proved thus. 1. Some of the mercies given are such as could no other way be procured and given, as is ordinarily granted: Such as are, the Universal Remission

miſſion, Juſtification, Adoption, and gift of Chriſt himſelf on condition that Men will accept them; Chriſt given as Redeemer ſuppoſeth his Redemption as to paying of the price to be paſt; Without Blood there is no Remiſſion neither conditional not abſolute (as is proved in the firſt Argument:) But a conditional Remiſſion to all, is given in the New Teſtament, *Ergo*, *&c.* The Remiſſion alſo of their puniſhment for the time of this Life, or at leaſt of ſo much of it, is actual (though not plenary) Remiſſion, and wicked Men partake of that; Of one of theſe two Chriſts ſpeaks in the parable of the ungrateful unmerciful Servant, *Mat.* 18. 27. 32. 35. [*The Lord of that Servant was moved with compaſſion, and looſed him, and forgave him the debt, &c.* His Lord ſaid, O thou wicked Servant, I forgave thee all that debt, *&c.* So likewiſe ſhall my Heavenly Father do alſo by you, if ye from your Hearts forgive not every one his Brother their Treſpaſſes.] But of this Text more hereafter. So that God doth remit to the Non-Elect moſt of the temporal puniſhment of their Sin actually, and all the Eternal puniſhment conditionally. That he remitteth the temporal puniſhment, is further proved, *Pſal.* 78. 38. [*But he being full of compaſſion for gave their iniquity and deſtroyed them not: Yea many a time turned he his anger away and did not ſtir up all his wrath*] He that reads out the reſt of the *Pſalm* will not believe that all theſe diſſembling *Iſraelites* were Elect. So for the legal forgiveneſs of Sin upon the uſe of Ceremonies, See *Lev.* 4. 26, 31, 35. and 5. 10, 13, 16, 18. and 6. 7, and 19, 22. *Numb.* 15. 25, 26, 28. *It ſhall be forgiven all the Congregation of the Chil-*

Children of Israel, and the Stranger that sojourneth among them, seeing all the People were in ignorance] but all *Israel* were not Elect, *Numb.* 14. 19. *Pardon I beseech thee the iniquity of this People, according to the greatness of thy mercy, and as thou hast forgiven this People, from Egypt, even until now.* 20. *And the Lord said I have pardoned according to thy Word, Dev.* 21. 8. *Psal.* 85. 2. *Isa.* 40. 2. So the Example of *Ahab*, the *Ninevites*, *&c.* Shew clearly: For that which God did in mercy in respect to their humiliation, was some kind of Remission. 2. And further I prove it as by these expres's Texts of Scripture, so by this Scripture reason: Either God remitteth much of the temporal punishment, or else he shews them no mercy: (And consequently they are not beholden to him, nor owe him any thanks) but God doth shew them mercy, *Ergo*, *&c.* He that remitteth none of the punishment due, sheweth no mercy, in this case: And he that sheweth mercy remitteth part of the punishment, for it was part of the punishment to be deprived of the mercies which wicked Men enjoy: Who dare once imagine, that Health, Strength, Friends, Liberty, Peace, Riches, Honour, Food, Raiment, Houses, Accommodations, Cattel, all Creatnres to serve us, Publick Peace, Sun, Rain, Fruits of the Earth, prospering of our Labours, *&c.* Knowledg, Parts, Motions of the Spirit, excellent means, and offers of Grace, Godly society and Examples, Admonitions, Tast of the good word of God and the powers of the World to come, Illumination, Partaking of the Holy Ghost, working Miracles, casting out Devils, hearing the word with joy, believing for a time,

clean escaping the pollutions of the World by the knowledg of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to be sanctified with the blood of the Covenant, to be loved of Christ (as the man was *Mar.* 10. 21.) to have the easiest place in Hell, &c. who dare say that none of all these are Mercies? Or that the enjoyment of these may stand with the full execution of the sentence of the Law? If the Curse lay in the deprivation of these, then the enjoyment of them is a remission of that curse or Penalty: But &c. *Ergo*, &c. read *Deut.* 28.

Now that this Remission is granted to none, but by virtue of Christs dying for him, I will now but refer you to the whole multitude of Reformed Divines, in their Writings against the Papists about Purgatory, Indulgences, and Humane Satisfactions, where they argue with greatest Zeal, and many Arguments, that temporal punishments are remitted only for Christ's Satisfaction: even the same men that deny Universal Satisfaction; not remembring how this overthroweth their own cause. The reason, I conceive, is, that here the evidence of truth constraineth them; but in the denial of Universal Redemption, they constrain themselves to it, meerly because they have not found out the way of reconciling Universal Satisfaction, with Special Predestination, and therefore think they are necessitated to deny the former (though against the clear light of many expres Texts of Scripture) for fear of contradicting the later.

1. *Amesius* saith, *Bellarm. Enervat. To.* 2. *li.* 3. *c.* 2. *p.* (*mihi*) 158. *Christus per spiritum suum nihil in nobis operatur, nisi virtute satisfactionis plena Deo antea pro nobis presentatæ. Neq; quidquam per nos facit,*

quod

quod ipsemet antea satis & perfecte fecit. 3. *Per Causas secundas Deus non operatur Creationem ex nihilo: sed Satisfactio & Redemptio eundem locum habent in ordine Gratiæ quem Creatio habet in ordine naturæ* (& p. 172. *Deus aliquando parcit iis quibus non est propriè reconciliatus, &c.*)

2. *Sadeel* is full this way, *Adversus humanas Satisfactiones*, p. 211. he saith, [*Aut Christus merito mortis suæ delet culpam peccatorum venialium* (*ut vocant*) *aut non delet; Si dicant, non delere: Ergo Christus non pro omnibus peccatis mortuus est, sed tantum pro mortalibus. O blasphemos homines si quidem id dixerint! & quid est aliud delere ac remittere culpam ejus peccati, quod ex ipsorum sententia pœnas temporales promeretur, quam nullas exigere pœnas temporales propter illud peccatum promeritas. Nesciunt profectò isti homines quid sit peccati culpa, nec advertunt pœnam peccati non posse definiri absq; mentione culpæ.* (So that sin it self may be said so far to be pardoned, as the punishment is remitted: and therefore he saith it was only the punishment and not the fault that Christ bore) p. 215. *At quomodo Christus satisfecit Deo pro peccatis nostris, An non id factum est quia Christus peccatorum nostrorum, non culpam pertulit sed pœnam. Sic.* p. 228. *Nam Christus* (*ut nostram non nostris, sed Augustini verbis explicemus sententiam*) *suscipiendo pœnam & non suscipiendo culpam, & culpam delevit & pœnam.*]

3. So *Chamier* at large, shews that it is only through Christ's Satisfaction that fault or punishment is remitted, and that God cannot remit without satisfaction, *Tom.* 3. *l.* 23. *c.* 2. §22. *ltaq; in genere concedo, non posse Deum impunita pec-*

cata dimittere, id est, nisi puniantur vel in peccatore vel in Mediatore: (of which *Voetius* in his *Thesis* is full) and § 31. *Nihil ergo rectius quam luisse pro nobis Christum pœnas: num aliquas tantum, an vero omnes? &c. si non luisset omnes, neminem liberant ab omnibus.* So that he takes the argument to be good *a liberatione ad solutionem per Christum*, and § 27. *Remissio opponitur exactioni pœnarum.* Now I have proved that God remitteth much punishment to wicked men not Elect: yea even in Scripture phrase, the remitting of that punishment is called, the Remission of their sin, as is shewed before, and lest any should say, it is but a delay of their punishment till the Life to come: I answer, 1. Is not punishment due to them both in this Life and that to come? And therefore to remit one is true remission. 2. No Scripture intimateth that God will lay so much the more on them in Hell, meerly because he punished them not more on Earth, but for their abuse of Mercy on Earth. 3. Doth not Christ himself expresly speak of not forgiving sin in this life or that to come? 4. Many have so much remission here, as tends to the great abatement of their everlasting torments: for Christ gives them that freedom from temptations, and such means, and common Grace, as brings them to be almost Christians, and almost Saved, and such as the man whom he is said to have loved, and said to him, *thou art not far from the Kingdom of God.* Whereas doubtless the rigorous execution of the Curse of the Law requires that men be wholly forsaken of God, as to any such Grace or Mercy, and consequently given up to the prevalency of their own Lusts.

And

And it is a doubt whether they that make all this Remission and Mercy to the Non-Elect, to befal them without the satisfaction of Christ, do not wrong Christ somewhat more than the Papists themselves (who in their vile Doctrine of Satisfaction and Indulgence) do ascribe all to Christ radically and remotely, and to man directly; saying that for temporal punishments Christ satisfieth in and by man, to whom he hath procured that power by his own immediate satisfaction. These give Christ some part of the honour, but the other none at all.

And that a conditional remission of the eternal punishment is given in the Gospel to the Non-Elect, under Gods hand, is so plain, that he that knows it not, knows not the plain tenour of the Gospel.

Besides, if it be said that all this can be given to the Non-Elect without Christs satisfying for them, then it would follow that it may be given to the Elect also without Christs satisfying for them, but all our Divines call that Impious and blasphemous (in their disputes against Purgatory, Indulgences, and humane Satisfactions.) Nay mark well, that the same conditional deed of Gift of Christ and his Benefits, which is uneffectual to Unbelievers, because they perform not the condition, is the same that becomes effectual to the Justification and Adoption of Believers, and that without any new additional real act of God.

Lastly, Satisfaction for one man will not serve to the remitting of any part of the Debt of another; so that I may conclude that Christ satisfied for All, seeing all receive the fruits of that satisfaction. The effects cannot be without their cause.

Arg. 19. *A comparatione Legis Gratiæ cum Lege operum.*

If Christ Died not for all (to whom the Gospel comes) then the Law of Grace doth contain far harder terms than the Law of Works. But the consequent is false, therefore so is the Antecedent.

The Consequence of the Major Proposition I prove thus: The Law of Works, as given to man in Innocency, required nothing that was Impossible for man in that state to do: But (if Christ satisfied not for all) the Law of Grace should require Impossibilities, and condemn men for want of them, and so should contain much harder terms than the Law of Works; Yea the Law of Works as given to fallen man (if so it were) contained nothing contradictory, and so impossible in it self, though man through sin was disabled to perform it: But the Law of Grace, should, if this Doctrine opposed were true. If the Law of Grace require men to take him for their Redeemer, and rest on him as their Redeemer, that never redeemed them, it should contain a contradiction. If according to this Law, men must be everlastingly condemned because they did not receive him as their Lord-Redeemer, that never paid for them any price of Redemption; and because they did not receive and apply to themselves the effects and benefits of a satisfaction, which was never made for them and so could not possibly be a cause of such effects; and because they did not rest on Christ to Justifie and Save them by his Blood which was never shed for them; these are impossibilities, and far harder terms than those of the Law of Works. Yea, if when man is already condemned, the Law of Grace say, that he shall undergo a far sorer punishment, and it shall be easier for *Sodom* and

and *Gomorrah* in the day of Judgment than him, except he will do these impossibilities, this is still harder. It is not all the believing in the World (supposing it were performed) that would make Christs Death, which is past, to be suffered for those that it was not suffered for. This makes Christ to come into the World to condemn the World, and that to a far sorer punishment than the Law of Works did oblige them to, without procuring them any possibility of escaping; For there's no possibility of that mans escape, for whom no price of Redemption is paid. Nay it lays an absolute necessity *ab extra*, and unavoidable, on men of perishing under this double damnation. For he that before I am born makes a Law, that I shall dye except I have part in a payment that was made 1000 years ago and that only for others and not at all for me, he doth necessitate my Death by that Law: For it is impossible that I should ever have part in it, if it were not paid for me. Now I know our Divines speak of Gods necessitating mans Damnation by Foreknowledge and Decree, which they call only *Necessitas Antecedentis, non Causæ*: But who ever affirmed that Christ in giving the New Law [*He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned*] did necessitate and that Causally, and that *Antecedenter ad Culpam*, the far greater damnation of miserable wretches that were condemned already.

And that the Gospel is not so much harder than the Law I prove: *Mat.* 11. 27, 28, 30. *My Yoak is easie, and my Burden is light*, *Heb.* 8. 6. *Jesus is the Mediator of a better Covenant stablished on better promises* [*Heb.* 7. 22. *And the Author of a better Testament*] *Rom.* 5. 14, 15, 20. *Where sin*

abounded, Grace much more abounded, John 3. 16. *God so loved the World, that he gave,* &c. *Eph.* 3. 19, 20. *Heb.* 11. 40. His service is a reasonable service: His Commandments are not grievous: His tender mercy is over all his Works. He is kind to the unthankful and unjust, His mercies lead men to Repentance: He delighteth not in the death of him that dyeth but rather that he Repent and Live: He calleth all men every where to repent and seek after God: All the day long doth he stretch out his hand to a froward and gain-saying generation: He dealeth not with us after our sins: He inviteth the Non-Elect to the Wedding Feast and telleth them that all things are ready: and some of them he compelleth to come in: as he did him that had not on the Wedding Garment: he chargeth his Messengers to beseech men in his stead to be reconciled unto God: He would gather under his Wings even as a Hen gathereth her Chickens, those that Will not be gathered. All these with a multitude the like, are the Scripture expressions of Gods gentle and merciful dealing with men under the Law of Grace. And so much of the execution as we see is answerable. He offers mercy to all in the Church: and confers much Mercy on every man in the World; He dealeth with no man according to the strict rigour of the unremedied Curse of the Law of Works. Abuse of the Talents of undeserved Mercy, is the thing that men must be condemned and perish for. No one sinner on Earth is excepted or excluded by him out of his Offer and Promise of Mercy, so be it, they will themselves consent, whoever Will may have the Living Waters freely, without

out Money and without Price: and if their sins be as red as Scarlet, he offers to make them as white as Snow; and to cast them all behind his back, and bury them in the depths of the Sea: He calls to them, return; why will ye dye? How long ye simple ones will ye love simplicity! and ye scorners delight in scorning and fools hate knowledge? Turn you at my reproof, behold I will pour out my spirit unto you; I will make known my words unto you, *Prov.* 1.22,23. He hath received Gifts for men, even for the Rebellious that the Lord may dwell among them God hath sent his Son Jesus to you (saith the Apostle *Act.* 3. last) to bless you, in turning every one of you from his iniquities. And when men will not hear, he saith, *O that my People had hearkened unto me, and* Israel *had walked in my ways, Psal.* 81. 13. *O that there were such an heart in them, that they would fear me, and keep all my commandments always, that it might be well with them, and their Children for ever. Deut.* 5. 29.

Can any man then believe that the tenour of the new Law or Covenant, is so much harder than ever was the Law of Works, as is before expressed? As for them that say, the New Covenant is no Law, and Wicked men or the Non-Elect are not under it, they manifest so great ignorance, and go against so full light of express Scripture, that I think them not worthy a confutation: Only I would have the Lutheran Divines remember, that near to the Apostles times, it was not only an unquestioned truth, but also was part of the Christian Creed, [*Christum predicasse Novam legem, & novam promissionem Regni Calorum*] *Tertullian. de Prescription cap.*

Arg.

Arg. 20. *A Legis Mosaicæ Abrogatione.*

If all men (that were any way under it) are freed by the blood of Christ, from the Bondage of the Mosaical Law of Ceremonies, then Christ died for All such, (and consequently not only for the Elect:) But the Antecedent is certain. *Ergo, &c.*

Some Divines say, that All the World were thus far subject to the Jewish Law, that they could not be saved without knowing it, and submitting to it in obedience, because God had then no other Church nor stablished way of Worship. If this be true, then all the World hath a deliverance in the Abrogation of that Law. Others say, that it obliged only the Jews and Proselites; and that others at the remotest distance should not have been obliged by that Law, if they had known it. If that be so, then it was only the Jews and Proselytes (such as had opportunity to incorporate with them, or joyn to them) that had this deliverence. However, it is evident it was to all the Jews, and so to more than the Elect: and then almost all the Arguments against Universal Satisfaction are hereby overthrown, for they are built on this, that Christ died only for the Elect.

Here I must prove, 1. That *Moses* Ceremonial Law is abrogate. 2. That it was done by the shedding of Christ's Blood for those that were under it. 3. That it is abrogated to All.

1. And for the first, it is so generally acknowledged, and the Scripture so expres in it, (specially *Act.* 15. and all the Epistle to the *Galatians*) that

that I may spare that labour, only some doubt whether the Moral Law as part of *Moses* Law be abrogate. But as long as we acknowledge. 1. That the same Moral Law standeth as it was part of Christ's New Law (which most confess) 2. And also as part of the Law of Works or Nature given to *Adam* (as most think) we need not much matter the former; Though I think that all *Moses* Law is Abrogated. 1. Because the Matter cannot stand as part of that Law when the Form ceaseth (for with the form, the essence and name is gone) and most (if not all) confess that the form of *Moses* Law (as it is specifically distinct from the Law of Grace) is abrogated. 2. The Apostle expressly saith (2 *Cor.* 3. 7, 11.) that [The Ministration of death, written and engraven in Stones, was glorious (and that was only the Decalogue) so that the Children of *Israel* could not stedfastly behold the Face of *Moses*, for the glory of his Countenance, which was to be done away. For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is glorious] some say, it was the Glory and not the Law that was done away, but it was not the glorious which *ver.* 11. is called glorious, but the Law, from the manner of delivery, and therefore it was not the Glory only, but the Law that is done away.

Obj. *But it was only the manner of delivery then that is dont away, and not the Law.*

Answ. That was a transient act, and ceased at the time, and was not done away by Christ. The Moral Law therefore as part of *Moses* Law is abrogated, because it is impossible the matter should

ſhould remain without the Form, as part of that *Compoſitum*. But the ſame Moral Law is in force as much as ever, as it is the matter of another *Compoſitum*, *viz.* the Law of Chriſt proper to the Goſpel times. The Law is in force ſtill *quæ fuit materia Legis Moſaicæ; ſed non quâ materia Legis Moſaicæ*. But for this, if any think otherwiſe, I will not contend with them It ſufficeth to my preſent purpoſe that it is granted that the Law of Ceremonies is abrogated. And that this Law was a burden and bondage is plain; even ſuch as the Church was not able to bear, *Act.* 15.10. ſee *Gal.* 3.23. & 21. & 4. 21. & 5. 3. &c.

2. And that it was Chriſts dying for men, that freed them from the Law, is proved *Gal.* 4.3, 4, 5. When we were Children we were in bondage under the Elements of the World, but when the fulneſs of the time was come, God ſent his Son, made of a Woman, made under the *Law*, to *Redeem them* that were under the Law &c. *Gal.* 3. 13. Chriſt hath Redeemed us from the Curſe of the Law, being made a Curſe for us, *Col.* 2. 14. Blotting out the hand writing of Ordinances which was againſt us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his Croſs, ſee *ver.* 20, 21. *Epheſ.* 2. 13, 14. 15, 16. But now in Chriſt Jeſus, ye who ſometimes were afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Chriſt, for he is our peace who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle Wall of Partition between us: having aboliſhed in his Fleſh the enmity, even the Law of Commandments, contained in Ordinances, for to make in himſelf of twain one new man, ſo making Peace.

And

And that he might reconcile both unto God in one Body, by the Cross, having slain the Enmity thereby.

3. And for the 3d. point that Christ hath abrogated *Moses* Law to all, Elect and Non-Elect without difference, is evident, in that all are forbidden to keep it: And that which is abrogated is abrogate to all, because the Word signifieth the total nulling of it, and destroying of its Essence, and that which is not, doth not bind. 1. Else the Non-Elect *Jews* (at least) should still be bound to offer all the Sacrifices, and use all the Ceremonies prescribed by the Law: But I never yet heard or read any Divine Preaching such Doctrin, and I hope never shall do. He that reads, *Act.* 15. and the *Epist.* to the *Gal.* and *Heb.* sure will not believe it to be true Doctrin, if he understand what he readeth. 2. Nay the very curse is so far taken away for all, that it now lyeth not on them as the unremedied curse of the Law, but is put into the power of the Lord-Redeemer, who hath by the tenour of his Testament or New Law, taken it away from all Men, on condition they will accept him: And this may be said also of the Law of Works as given to *Adam*; So that he that saith, Christ died only for the Elect, must needs say, (*I* think, if he will not contradict himself) that all the Non Elect must turn *Jews*, and be circumcised, and keep all the Law of *Moses*: And consequently that all the Elect themselves must do so, till God assure them that they are Elect and so that Christ died for them, Because they cannot avoid the duty upon a ground that is wholly to them unknown.

Arg.

Arg. 21. *Ab officio prædicantium Doctrinam Evangelii.*

If the whole or main work of the Preachers of the Gospel do suppose Christs Universal satisfaction as its ground, then Christ hath satisfied for all: But the Antecedent is true, therefore so is the consequent.

It is only the Antecedent of the Major proposition that requires proof. To which end let us enumerate the parts of the Work of Preaching: And the enumeration is to be taken from the enumeration of the parts of the New Law, for that is the subject which we must preach of: Now the Law, is, first a Declaration of the Occasion, or Narration of the matter of Fact, as an Introduction to the more essential parts. 2. Those parts themselves which are 1. The precept constituting duty: To which I joyn the prohibition, as one part of it, being but *præceptum de non agendo.* 2. The constitution of the *debitum premii vel beneficii.* 1. By an absolute promise. 2. By a conditional promise or gift. 3. The constitution of the condition as such. 4. The constitution of the *debitum Pœnæ*, by the threatning. This much *quoad materiam.* And then *quoad finem*, the Preacher must manage all these. 1. To the glorifying of God for the great work of Redemption. 2. For the winning of Souls to Christ, and confirming them in the Faith: This is the Ministerial Work.

Now. 1. For the Narration or Declarative part of the Gospel, which is matter of Assent; I have already shewed that if his Universal satisfaction

faction be not declared, the main part is left out, that should honour the Redeemer; and there is nothing declared that can groundedly encourage a Sinner to believe, and rest on Christ as a sufficient Saviour. 2. The precept is, that Men believe in Christ and rest on him as their Redeemer, for justification by his Blood: And the contrary unbelief and distrust is forbidden. Now what ground can a Minister have to press all Men to believe in Christ as their Redeemer, when they know he redeemed but the smallest part? Or to charge them to rest on his Blood for Remission, when he knows it was shed for the smaller number, and will profit none but those whom it was shed for? Yea how can he urge any to rest on Christ at all? For till they know they are Elect, they know not that Christ died for them (according to the opposed Doctrin: And till they know that Christ died for them, they cannot rest on him as their Redeemer, nor on his Blood as sufficient to procure their pardon, seeing (as is confessed) it is but materially and not formally sufficient, to pardon them if they should believe. And they cannot know that they are Elect or that Christ died for them, till they rest on him: And therefore I see not how any Minister can press Men groundedly to rest on Christ, by a justifying Faith, or to accept him as their Lord-Redeemer. And then for the duties of repentance, Love and Thankfulness to Christ for redeeming them, I have shewed before how this Doctrin evacuates them all, and so that no Minister can groundedly press them. 3. And for the promise, how can any Minister in Christs Name assure a sinner of pardon by that Blood which was never shed for him,

him, on condition he will believe. As if you ſhould ſay to a Debtor, believe that ſuch a Man hath paid thy debt. or truſt him, and then thy debt ſhall be diſcharged, when you know he hath not paid it, or know not that he hath? Indeed a Man may come off with ſome kind of truth in his words, if he certainly know that the Party will not believe. But the certain knowledg that Men will not believe, is not the reaſon why God calls them to believe, and offers them Chriſt and Life. 4. And for the threatening, with what Heart can a Miniſter tell Sinners, [Chriſt is a Redeemer but to the Elect, yet all the reſt of you ſhall periſh for not taking him for your Redeemer, and for not reſting on that Blood that was never ſhed for you.] And that as to the ends of preaching. 1. How will the divulging of theſe, glorify God? When he hath purpoſely deſigned the glorifying of Love and Mercy directly, and juſtice accidentally, by this great work of the Redemption of the World; and hath unhinged the Sabbath which was for Commemoration of the work of Creation, to the firſt day of the Week for the Commemoration of the Work of Redemption, which he will now have admired as his moſt glorious work, which (as *Ames.* in the place cited in Argument 18. ſaith) is to the works of Grace the ſame that Creation is to the works of Nature, and ſo is the ground of Gods New Right of Dominion and Empire, and of his governing and judging the World: And how is this glory eclipſed by the oppoſed Doctrin? 2. And for Mans Converſion to the Faith, I have ſhewed how unfurniſhed a Miniſter is, rightly to endeavour it on the oppoſed

posed grounds. Whereto let me add this: The Soul is never closed to Christ sincerely, till it close in Love: (Love being, as all Divines say, at the same moment of time as Faith, produced: And as *Maccovius* before-cited truly saith (and so forth *Chamier* and many more) Love to the Redeemer the object of Faith, is of the Essence of justifying Faith it self.) Now it is Love that must cause Love, I mean objectively, and not only *efficienter*. He cannot close in Love with Christ that knoweth nothing of Christs Love to him, though he know it to others, (so near is Man to himself; and Christ is to be received as my Redeemer, and not only as another Mans.) Now no Man can know that Christ loveth him with a special love, before he know that he himself loveth Christ (that's past question.) And yet no Man can soundly love Christ as Redeemer, that knows not Christs love to him: What remains therefore but that it must be Christs common love in redeeming the World, and making the conditional gift of pardon and Life, and this offered to me in particular among others, that must first cause my grounded love to Christ. Let us see what Scripture saith of the ground of Ministerial duties, *Math.* 22. The work of the Ministers was to invite the Guests, and compel them to come in: And the ground was, all things are ready: Else might not the Guests have said. [If we should come, there is nothing for us, we may go as we come You do but take this advantage to jeer us, because you know our minds that we will not come] 2 *Cor.* 5. 18, 19, 20. The work of Preachers is, the Ministry of reconciliation: And wherein lies it? *vers.* 20. *Now then we are Embassadors for*

Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christs stead, be ye Reconciled to God, so then the work of the Ministry is, to beseech Men in Christs stead and Gods name to be reconciled to God. But on what ground is this? *verse* 19, 21. *To wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the World unto himself not imputing their Trespasses to them, and hath committed to us the word of Reconciliation* (which Text we shall afterwards further explain and vindicate.) Is there not an absolute necessity that the price of Reconciliation be first paid to God and accepted by him, before any Sinner can be intreated to be reconciled to God on the ground of that price paid and accepted? Let me desire Ministers seriously to consider, with what Face they can stand up in the name of the Lord Jesus to beseech poor Sinners to be reconciled to God, and tell them that else they shall be doubly miserable, when yet there is no price paid for making them way to God, nor Gods justice satisfied for their Sin, which is supposed before any of their own endeavours can do any thing towards Reconciliation. Let me imagine such a Dialogue as this between such a Teacher and a Sinner?

Minister, *Sinner I beseech thee in Christs stead be reconciled to God.*

Sinner, I have Sinned so much that he will not be reconciled to me. All that I can do, will do nothing to bring me again into his favour.

Min. *Christ hath satisfied for all the Elect.*

Sinner. But what's that to me, unless I knew my self to be Elect.

M. *But Christ hath satisfied for all if they will believe?*

Sinner, Did you not tell me he satisfied only for the Elect, and that determined by name? Either he

he hath satisfied for me before I believe or not? if not, my believing will not satisfie, nor cause him to do it now. If he have, how shall I know it?

Min. *You must believe first, and then you shall know it afterwards: For God hath ordained inseparable connexion between Christs dying for Men, and their believing.: And therefore for all my beseeching you to believe, if you be not one that Christ died for, you neither will nor can believe, for none is able but those for whom he purchased it: But if you can believe it will be a sign to you* ab effectu *that Christ died for you.*

Sinner, Alas! Then all that are not redeemed (and I, if I be one of them) are far worse then hopeless and remediless: For they have neither any price paid for them, nor any one hath redeemed them, nor are they able, nor can be able to believe, and yet their torment must be multiplied for ever because they did not believe, and take him for their redeemer that never paid one farthing of their debt: But what is it that you would have me believe?

Min. *That Christ hath died for all that will believe.*

Sinner. Will that justifie? When the Devils believe that.

Min. *That Christs Death is sufficient to pardon all, if they would believe.*

Sinner. Then I should believe an untruth, for if all should believe, it is not sufficient to pardon them, because it was not suffered for them. Besides, the Devils do believe the sufficiency of Christs Death, as far as it is true.

Min. *But they believe not that it is sufficient for themselves.*

Sinner. Nor can I, except I knew that it was suffered for me.

Min. *But you must rest on Christ as a sufficient Redeemer,*

deemer, and then by reflecting on that Act you may know as by a certain sign that he redeemed you.

Sinner. Then I must believe a Propolition of uncertain truth, that I may know it to be true, and rest on an uncertain ground of trust, that I may have a Sign of its certainty: And so my first faith must be groundless and uncertain. But, as it is not in my power of my self to believe, so I have long been endeavouring to believe, and trying my Faith, and though I find I have some Faith (and so had many that perish) yet I cannot find whether it be sincere and saving: And I know many (yea most that seem godly) that never are sure all their life time, that their Faith is that which is justifying and proper to the Elect, and more then the unrooted Faith of temporaries: How shall I then, or any that are uncertain of the truth of their Faith, know that Christ died for them?

Min. *You must labour for assurance of the Truth of your Faith, that you may know that Christ died for you.*

Sinner. I no where find the Scripture using that motive to perswade Men to believe, or to get assurance: But what must I do in the mean time? and all such as I that never come to assurance?

Min. *Adhere to Christ as thy Redeemer, sufficient and willing to save.*

Sinner. But I have no knowledg whether he be either my Redeemer, or sufficient, or willing? And must I still continue that groundless Act? and that meerly to get a Sign, when yet it will be no sign till I attain assurance of the truth of my Faith? And must I never love Christ as my Redeemer, nor be thankful to him, nor praise him for it till I have assurance? *Respondeat qui potest.*

Arg. 22. *A differenti ſtatu hominum non-electorum, & Dæmonum.*

If Chriſt died only for the Elect, then all the reſt have no more remedy provided for their miſery then the Devils (nor are in any more capacity or poſſibility of Salvation) But the Conſequent is falſe, therefore ſo is the Antecedent.

Only the *Minor* requires proof, for the conſequence of the Major is evident: For he that hath no expiatory Sacrifice or ſatisfaction made for his Sin, is left utterly remedileſs: To ſay, he is not remedileſs, becauſe Chriſt is offered him, is but to deride him, while they ſay withal, that he is offered only an intereſt in the ſatisfaction that was never made for him, that ſo by not believing as by a ſign he might manifeſt that it was not made for him, and ſo that Chriſt did not purchaſe him Faith; And can the Devils be left worſe then remedileſs.

Now that Chriſt hath not left the Non-Elect as remedileſs as the Devils appears. 1. Chriſt ſpeaketh of his coming into the World and executing his office, as having ſuch ends to all Men, as they had not to the Devils, as he was the ſeed *Adam*, and took on him our nature and not the nature of Angels; ſo he never ſaith that he came into the World to ſave Devils, but he ſaith that he came into the World, *not to judg the World but to ſave the World*, of whom he expreſſeth unbelievers to be part *Joh.* 12. 47. 48. And God ſent his Son into the World not to judg the World, but that the World by him might

be saved: Even that World which in the next verse is distinguished into believers and unbelievers, *Joh.* 3. 16, 17, 18. It is never said that God sent his Jesus to bless the Devils in turning every one of them from their iniquities: But it is said so of every one of the *Jews* (Elect or not) to whom the Apostle spake *Act* 3 last, unbelievers perish not for want of an expiatory Sacrifice, but for rejecting it, not for want of a Jesus, but for want of Faith: But it cannot be said so of the Devils, God sendeth Men in his stead to beseech unbelievers to be reconciled to God (upon supposition of the payment of the price of Reconciliation by Christ to the Father:) But he doth not so to the Devils. All say Christs Death is sufficient to pardon all Men if they will believe (*Amesius cont. Bellar.* saith we never doubted of it: *Sadeel cont. human. satisfact.* saith, let him be blotted out from among the number of Christians that denieth it.) But I know none that dare say so of the Devils. To unbelievers is given Christ himself and all his benefits, by Gods Act and Deed on condition they will receive him: But who can shew such a deed of gift to the Devils? Giving Christ (though but on condition of acceptance to any one,) implieth and presupposeth, giving him on the Cross for them. God entreateth wicked Men daily to accept of Christ that they may live, but he never did so by the Devils. The Spirit of Christ convinceth and soliciteth some of the Non-elect to believe, and striveth with them till they grieve and quench it: But so he doth not by the Devils. All Men in the Church Elect and Non-Elect are called on to take heed lest a promise being left them

them of entering into rest, any of them should prove to come short of it through unbelief *Heb.* 4. 1: The wicked are condemned and everlastingly punished, for refusing a Redeemer, and not coming in to the Feast when all things were ready, and for neglecting so great Salvation, and treading under Foot the Blood of the Covenant, and because they would not have Christ to Raign over them; But it is far otherwise with the Devils, the wicked will be left unexcusable at the Redeemers Bar, when they are judged according to the New Law for refusing Christ that bought them: But the Devils would have excuse enough if they were judged on those Terms. So that I may well conclude, that the Doctrin is not sound which makes Christ to have died no more to expiate the Sins of the Non-Elect, then of the Devils but left them equally remedileſs: But such is the Doctrin now opposed, *Ergo*, &c.

Argum. 23d. *A statu hominum saltem non pejore statu Dæmonum.*

If Christ Died not for all, (that hear the Gospel) then Gods dealing with the Non-elect part of fallen Man is much harder than his dealing with the Devils, but the Consequent is false, therefore so is the Antecedent.

The *Minor* I think I need not prove, all acknowledge it that ever I heard or read, on this subject: If they should think that God dealt alike with the Non-elect and the Devils, yet sure none will say that he deals far hardlier with the Non-elect: Hell is prepared for the Devil and his Angels, they are reserved in Chains of Darkness

to

to the Judgment of the great Day; till then they believe and tremble, and look for the time of their full torment without any hope of escape: Compare with this, but what I have before proved to be Gods dealing with men, even them that perish, and you will see that their case is not worse than the Devils.

And for the Consequence of the *Major* Proposition, I prove it thus; by comparing both together. When the Devils had fallen from their first estate, God leaves them without remedy or hope of recovery. But when man is fallen, (according to the Doctrine which I oppose) God doth not only leave him remediless but also makes a new Law that shall oblige him to suffer a far sorer punishment, except he will believe in a Redeemer that is not his Redeemer, and trust for salvation to that Blood that was never shed for him, and accept the benefits of a satisfaction that was never made for him, even effects without a cause: Yea and causeth his Son to make a satisfaction materially sufficient for the sins of all; and yet had rather it were superfluous and vain, and meerly lost, then that it should be paid for him: As if he would rather when three Men owe 100 *l.* a piece, pay 300 *l.* for one of the three, than the other 200 *l.* should be tendred for the rest; And when he knows that Christ never satisfied for any of the Non-elect, yet doth he follow them with daily sollicitations by his Word, Spirit and Embassadors, beseeching them to come in and accept of Christ, ordaining and resolving that all these beseechings, shall harden them, or at least aggravate their sin and and misery, that it may be easier with *Sodom* and

Gomorah

Gomorrah in the day of Judgment than with them that refuse these Offers. And thus Christ shall necessitate them causally by his Law to a far greater torment, as if their misery were not sad enough before without procuring them any possibility of escape, (for there is no such possibility without satisfaction to God's justice,) If God should make a Law, that the Devils who are miserable already, should have far sorer punishment if they would not believe in Christ as their Redeemer who never redeemed them, would not this be harder dealing than now God useth toward them? when all the offer is on supposition that they cannot and therefore will not believe, and if it were possible to believe it would do them no good. If then this would be harder dealing with them, than those are hardlier used than the Devils with whom God so deals, and therefore he dealeth so with none.

Arg. 24. *A beneficâ Naturâ Evangelii.*

If Christ died only for the Elect, then should the Gospel to most men where it comes be of it self directly one of the greatest plagues and signs of God's wrath that ever he sendeth on a People on earth, but the Gospel is no such Curse, but a great blessing, *Ergo, &c.*

The Consequence is thus proved, That which brings an unavoidable obligation to a far sorer punishment, (without giving any possiblity either of escaping former misery, or this additional misery) must needs be one of the greatest Curses and Plagues in the World, and so the sign of Gods greatest wrath; but such were the Gospel (or

(or new Law) to most men where it comes (if the opposed Doctrine were true). *Ergo*, &c.

Let him that denys the Major, shew me a sorer Plague that ever God inflicted on any man on Earth, if he can.

Object. *Is not the Gospel the savour of death to some? and Christ a stumbling stone, and Rock of offence?*

Answ. That is not of his own nature, nor of the nature of the Gospel, nor yet as a proper Cause *per se*, but as an occasion, and by accident, through Mans own wickedness, and wilful rejection and abuse. A Man may burn himself with the fire that should warm him, or choak himself with the food that should nourish him.

Object. *But doth not God decree it?*

Answ. His decree causeth not the thing, any more than his foreknowledge, having no influence into the Object; as our Divines, *actus immanens nihil ponit in objectio. Predestinatio nihil ponit in prædestinato.* It imposeth no causal necessity as all confess, only as foreknowledge, so decree hath a Logical necessity, *in ordine argumentandi*, called *Necessitas Consequentiæ*, *Twisse* himself saith, there is no more, and the Schoolmen are of his mind in that, and affirm no more.

And for the minor, its evident in each part. 1. The new Law obligeth all that believe not, to damnation, because they believe not, and to a far sorer punishment than before was due to them, *Heb.* 10. 29. *Mar.* 16. 16. *Joh.* 3. 18, 19. *Mat.* 25. last. 2. And that it is an unavoidable obligation

gation appears, 1, In that God made the Law whether Man will or not, Man could not hinder that. 2. And it is an impoſſibility which the Law is feigned to require: To accept a Redeemer that never Redeemed them, to reſt on a ſatisfaction for their juſtification and pardon which is no ſatisfaction, for as to them it is none: It being maintain'd by them whom I oppoſe, that it is none, and that it is only materially ſufficient, that is, matter (of ſuffering) ſufficient to have made a ſatisfaction if God would; but not formally ſufficient; that is, indeed it is no price or ſatisfaction (as to their debt) at all; for if my Neighbour and I owe each of us 20*l.* he that pays his debt, though he over-pay, doth no more thereby to the diſcharge of mine, than if he had done nothing at all. I have proved before, that here is no ſufficient ground for that faith, ſuppoſing Chriſt ſatisfied not for the Believer. And even thoſe whom I argue againſt, will not endure to have it ſuppoſed that any Man ſhould believe for whom Chriſt dyed not. Or if they will let us ſuppoſe ſuch a thing, then it is undeniable that ſuch a Man would be never the more pardoned or ſaved, becauſe there is no Salvation without a Saviour, and no Remiſſion without ſatisfaction: And as in thoſe that are pardoned and ſaved, the efficacy of Chriſt's ſatisfaction is before all poſſibility of any power or ſucceſs of Man's Faith: So in thoſe that periſh (if they had no price of ſatisfaction paid for them) the want of a Redeemer would be the firſt want, concluding their damnation and non-deliverance from former miſery, and the want of Faith could be but the ſecondary conſequential want, which Faith if it were

were preſent would not ſatisfie or ſave, no more than believing now would ſave the Devils. And thus it is evident that on the grounds oppoſed, the Goſpel would cauſally *per ſe*, unavoidably be the greateſt plague on earth to all where it comes, except the Elect; and not only accidentally by their own Sin.

Now for the Minor (that the Goſpel is not ſo,) I prove from Scripture; it is called the glad tidings of the Kingdom of God. *Luke* 8. 1. Before men are Converted, the Apoſtles ſay. we declare unto you glad tidings, *Acts* 13. 32. 33. The Preachers of it bring glad tidings of good things, preaching the Goſpel of peace, *Rom.* 10. 15. even the unſanctified, receive the word with joy, *Mat.* 13. 20. (and not ſo great joy as they had cauſe) ſo *Mark* 4. 16. it is called the Goſpel of the grace of God, *Acts* 20. 24. it is a Wedding-Feaſt, even ready for thoſe that would not come to it, who are therefore ſaid to be unworthy of it; and ſo it was to him that came without the Wedding garment, *Mat.* 22. if it were not a mercy, then Men did not ſin againſt mercy in rejecting it, which who dare ſay? It gives men promiſes of entring into reſt, who yet by wilful unbelief may come ſhort of it, *Heb.* 4. 1, 2, 3, &c. See 1 *Cor.* 10. to the 13*th*, God ſent Jeſus to bleſs the *Jews* (more than Elect) *in turning every one of them from his Iniquity*, *Acts* 3. laſt. The unthankful Servant had his debt freely pardoned him, (and that was a mercy) who after took his fellow by the throat, and by ingratitude loſt that pardon which he had: It declareth God's tender Mercies over all his works, and ſuch mercies as are to lead all men to Repentance, *Pſal.* 145. 9. *Rom.* 2. It is

good

good tidings of great joy which ſhall be to all people, *Acts* 2. 10. It freely giveth to all the water of life, if they refuſe not the gift, *Rev.* 22. It is the Goſpel that bringeth Salvation to all men, *Tit.* 12. 11.

A hundred Texts might be brought to prove how great a bleſſing of it ſelf the Goſpel is to that People to whom it is given, and if it be turned to a Judgment and hurt them, it is meerly accidentally, through their wilful rejecting it, or turning the grace of God into wantonneſs, or ſinning, becauſe Grace hath abounded; and not from any thing in it, nor for want of a reality in the benefit which it offereth.

Arg. 25. *A differentiâ ſtatus damnatorum & viatorum.*

If Chriſt dyed not for all men, then the ſtate of moſt men (all that he dyed not for) were as deplorate and remedileſs as the State of the Damned: But the conſequent is falſe, therefore ſo is the Antecedent.

The Conſequence of the Major propoſition is plain, in that the ſtate of all men that Chriſt dyed not for muſt needs be utterly hopeleſs, and remedileſs, for there is no other ſatisfaction to be hoped for beſides that made by the blood of Jeſus, and that is nothing to them, nor is there any hope or poſſibility that ever they ſhould have part in a ſatisfaction that is no ſatisfaction for them; without blood there is no remiſſion: If they ſhould believe, and repent, and pray for mercy night and day, it would be but as the Rich Epicure in Hell pray'd for a drop of water, all in vain, for

for betwixt God and them is so great a gulf or distance by sin, that nothing without a Redeemer can do them any good, as to the least hope of Salvation. If you say, it is not to be supposed that they can believe, repent, and pray, I answer, that is (in your own sense) because it is supposed they are not redeemed, and the impossibility of their not repenting and believing shews the more fully the impossibility of their Salvation. And the reason why they do not actually despair, is not because they have any more remedy than the Damned, or cause to hope; but only because they are yet ignorant of the hopelesness of their own Condition, and as soon as they know the truth they will fully despair. So that there is no more possibility that a Man for whom Christ dyed not should be pardoned or saved, than that the Damned should, for both are equally impossible; If any say that God can find out another remedy besides and without Christs satisfaction, though he will not, and therefore it is not impossible. I will not examine the truth of that now, but if it be true of them on Earth, why not also of them in Hell? When once Men are in that state that there is no Sacrifice for their sin, then there remaineth nothing but the fearful expectation of Judgment, and Fire that shall devour the Adversary.

Object. *But doth not God's foreknowledge and decree make mens Salvation impossible, as well as Christs not Dying for them? and so your argument is as much against them.*

Answ. No, They do *nihil ponere in Objecto*; nor are the removal or denyal of any efficient cause of Salvation, they infer only *Necessitatem Consequentiæ*, they make no Mans Salvation impossible, but

but only prove it not future: And as it is not *omne Poſſibile* that is *futurum*, ſo neither *omne non futurum* that is *Impoſſibile*. And it is agreed that foreknowledge preſuppoſeth the *futurition* or *non futurition* of the thing foreknown. But there is much more neceſſary to be ſaid to reſolve this doubt which I may not now inſiſt on, only I add, that the matter of God's Decrees, and the futurition of things as depending thereon, are ſo high, and ſo far above us, that it becomes us not to be too inquiſitive into them, much leſs ſo peremptorily to determine of them as ſome do, and leaſt of all to try plainer Caſes by ſuch determinations, and reduce certainties to uncertainties, when we ſhould rather reduce uncertainties to certainties.

And for the Minor, (that the ſtate of moſt men even in the Church, is not ſo hopeleſs, deplorate and remedileſs as is the caſe of the Damned) I prove it thus. They might be ſaved who are yet on Earth, if they would but receive the love of the truth, 2 *Theſ.* 2. 9, 10. If they would believe they might all be juſtified, and ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting life; whoever of them will, may have the water of Life freely, and it is offered them, and they intreated to take it, and if they have it not, it is becauſe they will not, and not becauſe there was no object or ground for their willing, or no Sacrifice for their ſin. God offers them pardon and Salvation, but God offers no other Pardon or Salvation but what is purchaſed by Chriſt's Blood: He that tells us there neither is nor can be any other Remiſſion or Salvation, but what Chriſt purchaſeth, will not offer any other to men, and urge them to accept it, yea, Pardon and Life (as purchaſed by Chriſt) are in Gods deed of gift, together with Chriſt himſelf, conditionally

conditionally bestowed on all, even if they will have them, (a Condition which among men is seldom thought worthy the name of a Condition, it being supposed in nature that every man is willing of his own good, and so of all excellent advantages thereto.) Is all this so with those in Hell? Christ is neither given, nor Pardon and Life offered to them; they are not commanded to repent and believe to this end, that they may be justified and saved: But those on Earth are, and therefore their Pardon and Salvation is possible, for God will not command them to seek or to accept of an impossibility, and then Condemn them for not seeking and not accepting it. If the Damned could repent or believe, it would not save them, but it would save them on Earth. Nor is their belief it self such an impossibility, as is the Damneds believing. Moreover, Christ saith now, how oft would I have gathered you? But he would not gather the Damned. God would have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth, but he saith not that he would have the Damned to be saved. This Life is called the day of their Visitation, the day of grace, the acceptable time, the day of Salvation; and they are called on to hear the voice of God, *to day, while it is called to day, and not to harden their hearts, least he swear in his wrath that they shall not enter into his rest*; that is, least their case become desperate, and their Salvation impossible, therefore it was not so before. They are warned to take heed, *least sinning wilfully after the knowledge of the truth, there remain no more Sacrifice for Sin, &c.* Implying, that before there is a Sacrifice for their sin, it is said that it

is

is impoſſible to renew them by repentance, who tread under foot the blood of the Covenant, and do deſpight to the Spirit of Grace, implying, that before it was not impoſſible; and alſo that they might have had (if they had not) a ſhare in that blood and that Spirit. They have a promiſe left them of entring into his reſt, *Heb.* 4 1. and a Salvation proclaimed to them, and if they periſh, it will be for neglecting ſo great Salvation, *Heb.* 3. 2. They are invited to come in becauſe all things are ready; they are commanded to ſeek the Lord while he may be found, and call upon him while he is near: None of this is ſo with the Damned, God is not near them, nor may be found of them, nor have they any day of Grace, Viſitation or Salvation, where the word is preached, it is [that they might be ſaved,] 1 *Theſ.* 2. 16. *Paul* ſought the profit of many, and to pleaſe all men, that they might be ſaved, 1 *Cor.* 10. 33. Even when men are delivered to Satan for the deſtruction of the fleſh, it is that the Spirit might be ſaved, 1 *Cor.* 5. 5. yea, God ſent his Son into the World, that the World thro' him might be ſaved (that World which conſiſteth of Believers and Unbelievers) *Joh.* 3. 16. 17. when Jeſus was proving his Mediatorſhip to the Jews, he ſaith [*Theſe things I ſay that ye might be ſaved*] *Joh.* 5. 34. ſo that Mens Salvation is poſſible while they are on Earth (till they have ſinned againſt the Holy Ghoſt, or totally Apoſtatiz'd by abrenunciation of Chriſt,) elſe what buſineſs have Preachers with them? Why do we intreat them to be reconciled to God? Do we not tell them daily (and truly) that yet there is time, yet there is hope, and adviſe them to take

time while they have it; and let not slip the Day of Grace and Salvation, 2 *Cor.* 6. 1, 2. We beseech them that they receive not the Grace of God in vain: for behold, now is the accepted time: behold, now is the day of Salvation. And Christ saith, weeping, over *Jerusalem*, *If thou hadst known, at least in* this thy day, *the things that belong to thy Peace, but now they are hid from thine eyes*, &c. *Because thou knewest not the time of thy Visitation*, *Luk.* 19. 41, 42, 43, 44. An hundred places more might be produced to prove, that men on Earth are not left as desperate, deplorate, or remediless as those in Hell, which yet they must be if they had no Redeemer, or no Sacrifice for their sin.

Arg. 26. *A processu Judiciali & causa condemnationis.*

If Christ himself shall therefore condemn men in Judgment, because they received him not as their Lord-Redeemer, or because they abused the fruits of his Death, suffered for them, then he died for All men: But Christ will condemn men in Judgment because they received him not as their Lord-Redeemer, or because they abused the said fruits of his Death: Therefore he died for All-men.

That he will condemn all the Unbelievers that heard his Gospel, because they did not believe in him nor receive him for their Redeemer and Saviour, and Lord to Reign over them, nor rest on him for Salvation, is confessed by all, and past dispute, *Luke* 21. 27. *Joh.* 1. 10, 11, 12. & 3. 18. 1 *Joh.* 5. 11. 2 *Thes.* 1. 8. & 2. 10, 11, 12. *Mar.* 16. 16. *Joh.* 5. 22. *Mat.* 25. *per totum.*

That

That all men shall be judged according to their well or ill usage of the Talents of Mercy bestowed on them, and repenting or not repenting in the day of Grace, is plain in *Mat.* 25. in the Parable of the ten Virgins and of the Talents. I have proved before that these Talents are Grace (*i. e. Misericordia contra meritum, effectus*) and procured by Christs satisfaction, and not given without Christs satisfaction.

The consequence therefore of the *Major* proposition is evident. For shall any man dare, (without better proof) to affirm that Christ will sit as Lord-Redeemer in Judgment, and condemn most of the World to everlasting flames, for refusing a Redeemer that was not their Redeemer? and for not believing in him to save them by his death, who never died for them? and for not resting for Salvation, on him that never made the least satisfaction for them, and therefore was not a sufficient stay to rest on; and for not believing, where, if they had believed, Faith would do no good. And where it is objected (as before) they should have believed, that it might have been a sign to them that Christ died for them. I answer (besides what I answered before) 1. It being first granted that Christ did not dye for them, then if they had believed it would have been no sign that he died for them, for it cannot be a sign of that which was not. And Christs dying or not dying for them, for it cannot be a sign of that which was not. 2. Never Judge did pass sentence upon a sign instead of a cause: or make the want of a sign to be the cause of condemnation. Then the principal cause should be [*non Redimi:*] that Christ died not for us,

and the signal (which is our not believing) must be the less principal, And so the Sentence should pass thus [I adjudge thee to Hell Fire, for not being redeemed by my blood, and consequently for not having that faith which might have been a sign that I redeemed thee.] But who dare feign Christ Jesus to pass such a Sentence; Saith *Abraham* far be it from thee, to destroy the Righteous with the Wicked! shall not the Judge of all the World do righteously?

Also how could Christ condemn Pagans or any for not improving his Talents of Mercy, if they had none? And if Christ died not for them, they had none. For I have proved, it could not come any other way: Grace, as I said, proper to the Gospel, is [Mercy contrary to Merit] as Grace to the first man new created, was, [Mercy without Merit] now common or special Gospel Grace (contrary to merit) comes all from Christs Blood, and can come no otherwise. The Law came by *Moses*, but Grace and Truth came by Jesus Christ, of his fulness we all receive, and Grace for Grace. All the gifts in the Church, of Tongues, Miracles, casting out Devils, Healing, Prophesying (all which those may have that shall perish) are yet from one and the same Spirit, even the Spirit of the Son, procured by his Blood. In him it is that God blesseth us with all spiritual blessings (common or special.) Now if men have none of the Talents which Christ's Death hath purchased them, how can he condemn them for abusing that which they had not?

I know some reply, that God may condemn and torment his Creature without any fault, if he

he pleaſe, and that juſtly, becauſe his Will is the rule of Juſtice. To which I anſwer as he is *Dominus Abſolutus* he may do with his own as he pleaſe, and therefore may torment the Creature as he pleaſe (at leaſt he might have done, before he undertook to diſpoſe of them as Rector according to his Laws) but as he is Ruler of the Rational Creature, he will not, and therefore cannot condemn or puniſh any but for ſin; ſeeing every puniſhment is eſſential *for a fault.* And therefore if God ſhould torment the undeſerving Creature, it would be but an Affliction or meer Suffering (which is the matter of Puniſhment without the form) but no puniſhment: And therefore it would be neither juſt nor unjuſt, being not capable of either Title: But to ſay that God as Judge can condemn or puniſh a man without deſert, is plain Blaſphemy.

Arg. 27. *A condemnandorum inexcuſabilitate.*

If Chriſt died not for all, then the condemned would not be left without any juſt excuſe, But the condemned ſhallbe left without a juſt excuſe, therefore Chriſt died for All.

The *Minor* is plain in Scripture. *All mouths ſhall be ſtopped, and all the World be guilty before God, Rom.* 3. 19. And Chriſt ſaith, *They have no Cloak for their ſin.* See *Rom.* 1. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, &c.

And for the conſequence of the *Major*, there is enough ſaid to prove it before. And further let me add for explication a few words. Excuſe is contrary to Accuſation: As there are therefore divers ſorts of Accuſation, ſo is there of Excuſation: Men may be Accuſed at the Bar of

God. 1. Upon the grounds afforded in the Law of Works. 2. Or according to the Mediators new Law, or the Law of Grace. According to the Law of Works men may be accused. 1. Of violating the Precept. 2. Of being liable to the penalty: For the first of these no man on Earth hath any just excuse, for all have sinned, and must confess it, *and he that saith he hath no sin is a lyer.* 2. If any man be accused of being liable to penalty according to the tenour of the Law of Works, this also must be confessed and hath no excuse: no not for them that Christ died for in the strictest sense, or that are Justified. 2. And for Accusation in the reference to the Law of Grace, either men will be accused, 1. Of not performing the duties of that Law, as commanded. 2. Or of not performing the condition of it, as it is a condition. 3. Or of being liable to the penalty. 1. Privative. 2. Positive. 1. For the first, all men must confess that they are guilty: For though in the Law of Nature the Duty commanded, and the condition, were the same, yet in the Law of Grace, the Duty commanded is of larger extent than the condition. For perfect obedience is commanded, though only faith and sincere obedience be the condition: Only the Duty commanded is the matter about which sincere obedience, which is part of the condition is exercised. Now here no man can excuse himself by saying that he hath done all that Christ commanded him: But the non-redeemed may excuse themselves for not doing it: For against every part of the Precepts proper to the Gospel, they have excuse, as will appear anon, when we speak of the conditions. 2. The condition of

the

the new Law or Covenant is, Faith working by Love, Repentance, Thankfulness and sincere Obedience. He that performeth not these must perish. Now if an unredeemed person shall be accused for not performing these, though he must confess the non-performance, yet he hath these reasons to give for his excuse. 1. Where there is no gift, there can be no condition, in proper sense, of obtaining: But Christs blood was not given to us, and consequently not the proper fruits of it. Therefore 2. How could we believe in, or receive Christ as our Redeemer, who never Redeemed us? Or trust to his Blood for Justification, which was never shed for us? And therefore would not have been sufficient to save us, had it been possible for us to have believed in it, or had we actually believed? Moreover believing to Justification, is but the accepting or receiving Christ as an offered Saviour and Head, or as conditionally given us, *viz.* if we will receive him (this is commonly confest:) now how can there be a receiving or accepting without a giving? Is there any contradiction more palpable? We therefore to whom Christ was not given could not receive him: and if he were not given for us, he could not be given to us: seeing the latter doth presuppose the former. 3. Repentance to Life presupposeth some hope of Life given (I mean, *spem possibilitatis, & probabilitatis, & si non spem certitudinis.*) But there is no hope given to any, but in and by the blood of Jesus Christ shed for them: for there is no other name by which they can be saved; without this hope we might have an Infernal despairing tormenting Repentance, but could not possibly have a Re-

pentance unto Life, or such as could be to us any means of our recovery (as all Gospel Repentance is.) And it was not in our power to give hope to our selves by causing Christs blood to be shed for us, had we been never so willing. 4. How could we love God as merciful in Redeeming us, or love Christ as our Redeemer when we knew him not to be our Redeemer; and it now appears he never was our Redeemer. 5. How could we love the Brethren as our members of the same body, and our fellow-redeemed ones (which is the new commandment) when they were none of our Brethren in that sense, nor could we prove that they should be so? 6. Why should we be thankful to Christ for Redeeming us, when he did not at all redeem us, Should we be thankful for nothing? 7. How could we obey Christ as our Lord-redeemer, who was not our Lord-redeemer? How could we hear him as such, and call on him as such, or trust him as such, ? If his offices are all of equal extent, and it be certain that he was no Priest to us, as not offering himself a sacrifice for us at all; then he could be no King or Prophet to us. And why then should we obey a King that is not our King? Or, Why then should we hear that Prophet who was no Prophet to us?

3. And then as to the last accusation; if men be accused as being lyable or obliged to the penalty, for non-performance of the condition; or for want of a Saviour: Every true Believer hath two things to answer for his full Justification: 1. That Christ hath satisfied for him (and therefore the Laws obligation

is

is justly dissolved.) 2. That he hath himself performed the condition of the new Covenant? (and therefore hath part in Christs satisfaction, and is not to be condemned as an Unbeliever) or ungrateful Rebel, and therefore ought not to be deprived of the reward or benefit given, (which is deliverance from the Curse of the Law and the guilt of sin and deserved punishment, together with a greater superadded glory:) Nor yet to suffer the positive penalty (which is both the Non-liberation from the foresaid misery, and the greater torment threatned to unbelievers.) Now the unredeemed may all plead that the said penalties are not due to them. 1. Because no redeemer did ever satisfie for them; and they could not satisfie for themselves, nor cause Christ to satisfie for them; which is ever presupposed to their own believing; seeing believing is but to give them a right to the satisfaction and benefits of Christ, and not to be our righteousness as of worth in it self; now all the believing in the World would not make that satisfaction to be for me, which was never made for me, but only for another, no more than believing that another man hath paid my debt, would make it true; or make a payment to be for me which was only for another: As Mr. *Perkins* saith [and least any should imagine that the very act of Faith in apprehending Christ justifieth, we are to understand that Faith doth not apprehend by power from it self, but by virtue of the Covenant: If a man believe the Kingdom of *France* to be his, it is not therefore his: Yet if he believe Christ and the Kingdom of Heaven by

Christ

Christ to be his, it is his indeed: Not simply because he believes, but because he believes upon promise and commandment; for in the tenor of the covenant God promiseth to impute the obedience of Christ to us if we believe.] *Vol. 1. True Gain. page 662.* So that the unbeliever hath this excuse, that his believing supposed the Gift and Promise, and he could not by believing have made satisfaction to Gods Justice (Faith having no such worth, nor being ordained to that end) nor yet could he get interest in a satisfaction never made for him: Nor would God have imputed such a satisfaction or obedience to him, had he never so much believed. Indeed he deserves the misery threatned by the first Law for sin against the Creator, or for sin as sin; but not the penalty proper to the new Law; either privative consisting in non-liberation, or positive, as in sorer punishment. 2. Besides he is excused by the former reasons which excuse him for non-performance of the conditions; for then he cannot be punished for that non-performance. If the Devils were accused for not believing in Christ as their Redeemer, and consequently being obliged to the penalties of the new Covenant, would not they have all this excuse?

Argum. 28th. *A natura pœnæ infernalis positivæ.*

If Christ Died not for all (but only the Elect) then Conscience will not torment the Damned for rejecting Christ their Lord-Redeemer,

deemer, or the fruits of his Redemption: But Conscience will torment them for so rejecting Christ and his benefits (and thereby wilfully procuring that destruction which else they might have avoided) *Ergo, &c.*

The Argument seems to me so clear that I need not say much in confirmation of any part of it.

1. For the *Minor* it is generally granted,

1. That the Torment of Hell lieth much in the Horrors and Accusations of Conscience.

2. And that this is a right judging, and not an erring Conscience. It is not melancholy mistakes that torment poor Souls in Hell (as to think they have sinned when they have not) but the apprehensions of real evils in and upon them.

3. Conscience will never torment men for that which never was in their power to avoid, (directly or indirectly, in it self or in the means) though he had been never so willing. Did you ever see a rational man wounded in Conscience for not being an Angel, or not seeing God face to face, or not redeeming his own Soul? But it is for wilful sinning that mens Consciences scourge them. When there was a possibility of being saved, yea a probability put into our hands, yea a certainty if we would yield to Christs conditions; and yet men did negligently and wilfully slight all, this will wound them everlastingly: This will feed the never-dying Worm, and make them cry out against themselves for ever, O what a fool, what a wilful wicked self-hater was I, that had

a price

a price in my hands, but had not a heart to improve it! That had a Redeemer offered me that suffered for my sins, and had not a heart to receive him: That had his blood tendered me for the washing of my Soul, and the healing of my Wounds, and had not a will to accept it! That might have had Christ, and Pardon, and Adoption, and Salvation, and would not! I thought my pleasures and profits better than Christ and Glory! I chose dung and dross before the Crown of Life. How justly am I now excluded from that blessedness, which I set so light by, and endure that misery which I wilfully run into. (See more of this in the Third Part of my Book of Rest, in the aggravations of the Damneds Torments.

But if the damned should then truly know that there was never any possibility of their recovery; and that Christ never died at all for them; nor was their Redeemer; and that if they could have or had believed, it would not have saved them; yea that Christ being never given for them, could not consequently be given to them, and consequently could not be accepted or received as being not an object capable of being received; yea that God could not give them pardon and Salvation as purchased by that Blood that was never shed for them, had they believed never so much; will not this take of all the accusations of conscience, and turn all their clamors against God himself? And so make Hell thus far to be no Hell? If a great Man come to a poor Prisoner, and say, take me for the payer of thy debt, (as having already done it) and thou shalt be free, and

more

moreover advanced, but otherwise thy imprisonment and punishment shall be far sorer] suppose the Man believes him not, and thereupon is closer imprisoned and grievously punished: If the offer were real upon a true discharge of his debt, the Prisoner will blame himself: But if it be certainly known to him that there was no such discharge or payment, and that it was offered meerly to increase his misery, because the offerer had some foreknowledg that he would not believe him, and that if he had believed him he had been never the better, because no payment was made, would this Man blame himself? Or would he not approve of his own unbelief, and say, why should I have trusted such a one? And would he not have cried out on the offerer as a deceiver, and unjust and cruel? Consider and judg. And thus with the *Minor* I have also confirmed the Major Proposition. Christ told the *Jews*, If he had not come and spoak to them (and done the Works that no Man else could do) they had not had Sin (in not believing on him) but now they had no Cloak for their Sin. But if Christ had not redeemed Men nor been an object for their Faith, then much more evidently may it be said that they had not had Sin who had not believed in him or taken him as their Redeemer: For defect of an object will more excuse then defect of evidence. If the Works of God discovering his invisible things, leave Sinners (Heathens, as most Exspositors judg) without excuse; and so they had been excusable but for those works; much more excusable would unbelievers be, if they had no Redeemer to believe in,

in, what ever proclamations of him were made to the World: And consequently conscience would excuse the damned, and so would not torment them, for an excusing conscience tormenteth none. But whatever Men may say now, I am certain that those miserable damned Souls will have no such alleviation of their misery: They shall not be able then to stop the Mouth of conscience by all the Arguments against their Redemption that now seem so strong; nor to say, what should I vex my self for that which I could never help, if I would; and torment my self or accuse my self for not accepting a Redeemer that never was given me? Or for not redeeming my own Soul.

Arg. 29th. *A natura Pœnæ infernalis Privativa.*

If Christ died not for all (but only for the Elect) then the punishment of the damned should not at all consist in a Privation of the But Fruits of Christs Sacrifice (or satisfaction.) the punishment of the damned (at least many, if not all) will consist in a privation of the Fruits of Christs satisfaction, *Ergo, &c.*

For the better understanding of the force of this Argument you must know, 1. That there may be a Privation of that which we are but in a possibility or probability of enjoying, much more if we have a certainty on some easie, and reasonable condition; specially if the condition be but the accepting of a free gift; as well as there may be a Privation of what is actually enjoyed.

joyed. 2. Though some that understand not the nature of the New Covenant or Law do deny that it hath any peculiar penalty, yet it is a clear truth beyond doubt. For 1. It is an entire law, and therefore doth promise and threaten, and consequently doth *premiare & punire* reward and punish. 2. It is that Law by which we shall be judged at the Redeemers bar, and therefore it doth reward and punish, that is, constitute the dueness of rewards and punishments: else it could not possibly be *Norma judicii* in Absolution, and condemnation. 3. It is said expressly, *Heb.* 10. 22. Of how much sorer punishment shall they be thought worthy that tread under Foot the Son of God, *&c.* And therefore the punishment of unbelievers in the New Testament is expressed to be in unquenchable Fire prepared for the Devil and his Angels, whereas the punishment of the old Law was expressed but by the name of Death, or at least not so hideously as the other. Not that I am any whit of their opinion that think, there was no actual everlasting pain threatned by the old Law, but only annihilation: Nor will I contest against any Man that saith, it is only a punishment gradually different (as to the positive part, and much of the privative) from that of the first Law which is threatned by the second: For a gradual natural difference may constitute a moral specifical difference: It is but in degree of pain that a prick with a pin differs from *Cæsars* stabs in the Senate House, or from the pulling of a Mans Flesh of his Back with Nails or hot Pincers. Yet some of the privative, and objective of the positive

positive torments of the two Laws do differ *in specie*. For as to the positive, the consciences of the damned shall torment them for rejecting a Redeemer, and pardon, Adoption, and Glory with him: But according to the first Law, conscience should only torment Men for casting away that Life that *Adam* did enjoy (or if more were promised, for not obeying perfectly that they might attain it.) 4. And it is undeniable that this New Law hath a punishment privative specifically distinct in *Natura rei* from that of the old Law. That is, the privation of Christ as their Head, and of pardon, justification by him, Adoption by him, and Salvation from deserved misery, beside, the loss of a greater promised glory, yea and a second loss of their first happiness. If any therefore shall say, that because Men are condemned already and the Gospel doth only *Non-liberare* not save unbelievers, therefore it is a meer promise, and not a Law, and so hath no proper penalty of its own; I answer. 1. I have shewed it hath a sorer punishment as its positive penalty. 2. The denial of a greater glory, which Christ giveth by the New Law, above what the old Law gave, is a proper and grievous punishment. 3. The denial of those blessed Relations of [a Member of Christ and in him an adopted Son of God, and Heir of Heaven, *&c.*] is a sore and proper punishment. 4. The Privation even of that Life which was given by the first Law, is a proper penalty of the second, because the New Law, doth restore to all Men their lost right to Life, on an easy condition, and therefore as the Privation of Life

is firſt given or promiſed in the firſt Law, was the penalty of that Law, ſo the Privation of the ſame Life as redeemed and reſtored by the Mediator, is the penalty of the new Law: So that it is a recovered happineſs that they this way loſe, and ſo are *twice dead*, as *Jude* ſpeaks. 5. The very *Non-Liberation* of the new Law, in denial of Remiſſion and Salvation, is a great and proper penalty: As the Non-continuation of *Adams* happineſs in paradiſe was a penalty of that Law (and the not-giving of a greater, if that Law did promiſe a greater.) If a Prince make an Act of pardon and oblivion for a company of impriſoned condemned Malefactors in theſe terms, that if they will repent and thankfully accept his favour, they ſhall all be pardoned, and alſo dignified to be Princes and his Favourites: If they will not, none of them ſhall be pardoned, but all ſhall die by a more cruel Death. Here this Law of Grace hath as its peculiar penalty. 1. Their Non-liberation, and ſo their firſt deſerved Death, not as firſt deſerved, but as confirmed, and peremptorily adjudged to them for their ingratitude; and ſo. 2. The loſs of Life, as it was conditionally reſtored, and was in Law, as it were, a new Life. 3. And the loſs of the promiſed offered dignities. 4. And the ſorer kind of death, ſo is it in the caſe in Hand.

For the confirmation of the *Minor*, I need not to ſay much more, ſeeing for ought I know it is generally granted. I never met yet with any, that durſt ſay that all the Non-Elect do undergo none of the fore deſcribed penalties of the new Law; but only the meer penalties of the

first Law: Doubtless God is offended specially at their unbelief, and will destroy them as Christs Enemies because they would not that he should Reign over them, *Luke* 21. 27. and Christ will come in flaming fire rendring vengeance to them for not knowing God, and not obeying the Gospel of our Lord Jesus 2. *Thes.* 1. 7. 8. 9. and he will damn them all that obeyed not the Truth (of the Gospel) but had pleasure in unrighteousness, 1 *Thes.* 2. 10. 11. 12. And this is the condemnation that Light is come into the World and Men love darkness rather then light because their deeds were evil: And because when Christ came to his own, his own received him not, *Joh.* 1. 10. 21, 11. For it shall come to pass that every Soul that heareth not the voice of this Prophet shall be destroyed, *Acts* 3. 23.

And they that believe not Jesus is the Christ shall dye in their sins; And except men repent, they shall all perish, *Luk.* 13. 3, 5. yea *whoever believeth not shall be damned, Mar.* 16. 16. *For he is the Author of Eternal Salvation to them* (only) *that obey him, Heb.* 5. 9. So that as men suffer for sin against the new, so also from the obligation of that Law binding them over to Judgment: and therefore they are judged by that Law, *Mat.* 25. yea I doubt not but all the World shall be judged by the Redeemer, for misimploying his Talents of Grace (those that perish) and not only for not perfect fulfilling the Law of Works: none is condemned meerly for that. And if it be so, then the same Law of Christ must needs constitute the penalty to be executed. Nor did I ever meet with

any

any that durst say that it was no punishment to Unbelievers, to be denied Pardon and Justification and Salvation from their deserved damnation, which were all offered to them in the Gospel, and which Believers do receive: much less should any say, that the additional torments of such, and the loss of the greater promised glory are no punishments. Yea even in this life the non-elect receive of the punishments proper to the new Law, *viz.* non remission and non reconciliation, and the forsaking of God, when he casts them off, and gives them up to themselves because they would none of him, *Psal.* 81. 11, 12. and leaves them desolate because when Christ would have gathered them to him in tender mercy, they would not, *Mat.* 23. 37, 38. and gives them over to believe lyes because they received not the love of the Truth that they might be saved, 2 *Thes.* 2. 10, 11. and takes his holy Spirit from them, because they grieved and quenched it.

And all this will be out of doubt if we consider the definition of Punishment, which is a natural evil inflicted because of a Moral: or the hurt of our persons inflicted for sin. Now there is no doubt but all these forementioned are evils to us, or hurtful to mens persons; and no doubt but they are inflicted for sin: and then as to the species; They are inflicted for sins against the Law of Christ, by force of the obligation of the commination of that Law, and the sentence past by Christ as Redeemer and Author of that Law. Yea what if I said that strictly and directly men suffer not at all the penalty of the Law of Works? For all are

delivered from that penalty on condition they Repent and Believe, and so the obligation of that Law is suspended to all, (though not strictly abrogated) and transferred, and as it were sequestred into the hands of Christ to be disposed of by him, (inflicting or not inflicting it) as men deal with him according to his terms of Grace, so that now, the penalty is immediately and strictly the penalty of the Law of Christ, as it doth both *non-liberare* and peremptorily bind men over to it; and it is properly the loss of a Life recovered by Christs blood, which is the punishment; though remotely it be also from the obligation of the first Law, which being but suspended by Christ, and conditionally dissolved, remaineth in force upon the non-performance of the condition, as soon as the time of performance is expired. So that it is undeniable that the damned suffer the privation of the fruits of Christs death and satisfaction: yea and of his satisfaction for them in perticular. For as it is certain that there is no remission without blood, and no Justification or Salvation without Christs satisfaction; so it is as much beyond doubt with all sober men, that Christs satisfaction for one man will not procure Pardon and Salvation for another. So that the *Minor* is fully clear.

And for the *Major* proposition it is as clear. For there can be no effects without a cause: As no man can receive the effects of Christs Death, but those for whom he died; so no man can lose or be deprived of those effects, but those for whom he died; for the cause is presupposed. A Negation is no Punishment.

It

It is not a punishment to a Stone that it is not a Man, that it is mute, liveless, &c. nor to a Beast, not to be saved, nor to an Angel not to be Redeemed, nor to the Devils, not to be partakers of Christ, and of Pardon and Salvation by him. Now its true, the Pardon of the Damned, and their Salvation was not actually effected, but the meritorious cause was full and perfect in Christs satisfaction (and moral causes go long before the effects sometimes, and may do all their part, and yet the effect not follow through the defect of some other,) and the effects were conditionally given or produced by the New Covenant, and thereby become not only possible and probable, but certain if the condition were performed: So that here is a proper privation, and not a bare Negation. Nor is it the meer matter of such effects that men are deprived of, but formally as they were effects conditionally granted, and were to have been effects actually of the death of Christ. They should have been such effects, if they had done their part to procure them by performing the condition as Christ did in the Cause; for he required not them to effect it as concauses, but only suspended the effects of his own full sufficient (but Moral) cause, on their condition, which all Lawyers, and all that know what a Moral Cause is, or what a proper condition is, know to be most usual. Now if you suppose that Christ died not, and satisfied not for these men, then the loss of Pardon, Adoption, Membership of Christ, final Absolution, Salvation, besides all the greater Glory, and all the Spirits Graces and Work-

ings in this life, cannot possibly be punishments to them, for they cannot be Privations. For there was never any cause to procure them, and therefore they were never possible, much less due: and Mans Faith was not required by God to be the meritorious cause, or to satisfie Gods Justice, nor yet to procure Christ or any other to satisfie it, nor yet to make that satisfaction to be now for us, which was made for others and not for us: to none of these ends was Faith required. but only to be the condition of our enjoying Christ, and the fruits of his satisfaction; on performance whereof the Moral Cause which was long before in full being, should produce its effect, or else not (as to us) so that satisfaction as the Cause is necessarily supposed to Faith as the condition, seeing the office of the condition is, that on it the effect of the cause be suspended, till that condition be performed: And therefore there can be no condition where there is not first the Moral Cause: I mean there can neither be condition constituted by Law, Testament, Deed of Gift, or Covenant, nor yet condition performed, for it cannot have the form of a condition. Or if that be disputable as to any other case, I am sure it is not in the case in hand; No man will say that the non-remission, non-salvation of the Devils by the Blood of Christ, is a Punishment to them.

Object. *That is because it was never offered or conditionally given them by Covenant, as it was to the Unbelievers.*

Answ.

Answ. Nor could it have been given so to Unbelievers, if Christ had not died for them. Could God give them Christ as a Satisfier and Redeemer, who never had satisfied for them or redeemed? Or could he make over to them effects which had no Cause, *viz.* the effects of his dying for them, when he did not dye for them? Would the New Covenant serve to pardon men without Christs Sacrifice and Satisfaction? Nay is it not beyond all doubt that this which I call the New Covenant or Testament, *He that believeth shall be saved*, &c. is the Redeemers Law and Testament, and presupposeth his Death and Satisfaction, *in esse Morali* at least: It is the New Testament in his Blood, he first buyeth men to be his own by satisfaction, and then dealeth with them as his own by Promise and Legislation: Only the Promise of God to give Christ for a Redeemer to the World, and his Propheſies of him therein, are in order of nature before the Moral being of Christs death, but so is not the Law of Grace. I know nothing that hath any great shew of Reason that can be said against this Argument, which so clearly evinceth the truth of Universal Redemption, and for vain objections, I will not trouble my self and the Reader with them.

Arg. 30. *A Comparatione doctrinæ universalem satisfactionem affirmantis cum doctrinâ eandem negante.*

If they who assert Universal Redemption (*quoad satisfactionem & pretium*) have all these fore-

mentioned Arguments from Scripture for their cause, and a multitude of expres Texts, and no one ill consequence following their doctrine, nor one sound Reason, nor one text of Scripture against them; And if the deniers of Universal Satisfaction have all the contrary disadvantages; then they that affirm Universal Satisfaction are in the right, and they that deny it do err. But the antecedent is true, *Ergo. &c.*

Here I will 1. Look over these Arguments again, and from thence shew you the face of the consequents of the denial of Universal Satisfaction.

2. I will lay you down together the expres Texts that are for Universal Satisfaction

3. And also the Texts that are brought against it.

4. And then the particular search of those texts on both sides, and the answer to all the Arguments that are usually brought against Universal Satisfaction, I intend shall follow afterward in their own places more fully.

The Doctrine which denyeth Universal Satisfaction hath all these inconveniences, and absurd consequents, following, therefore it is not of God, nor true.

1. It either denieth the Universal Promise or Conditional Gift of Pardon and Life to all men if they will believe, and then it overturneth the substance of Christs Law and Gospel promise: or else it maketh God to give conditionally to all men a Pardon and Salvation which Christ never purchased, and without his dying for men.

2. It

2. It maketh God either not to offer the effects of Christs satisfaction (Pardon and Life) to all, but only to the Elect: or else to offer that which is not, and which he cannot give.

3. It denieth the direct object of Faith, and of Gods offer, that is *Christum qui satisfecit*, [a Christ that hath satisfied.]

4. It either denieth the Non-Elects deliverance from that flat necessity of perishing, which came on man for sinning against the first Law, by its remediless unsuspended obligation, (and so neither, Christ, Gospel or Mercy, had ever any nature of a remedy to them, nor any more done toward their deliverance then towards the deliverance of the Devils:) Or else it maketh this deliverance and remedy to be without satisfaction by Christ for them.

5. It either denieth that God commandeth all to believe (but only the Elect: Or else maketh God to assign them a deceiving Object for their Faith, commanding them to believe in that which never was, and to trust that which would deceive them if they did trust it.

6. It maketh God, either to have appointed and commanded the Non-Elect to use no means at all for their Recovery and Salvation, or else to have appointed them means which are all utterly useless and insufficient for want of a prerequisite cause without them, yea which imply a contradiction.

7. It maketh the True and Righteous God to make promises of Pardon and Salvation to all men on condition of believing, which he neither would nor could perform (for want of such satisfaction

satisfaction to his Justice) if they did believe.

8. It denieth the true sufficiency of Christs Death, for the pardoning and saving of all men, if they did believe.

9. It makes the cause of mens Damnation to be principally for want of an expiatory Sacrifice and of a Saviour, andnot of believing.

10. It maketh Christ to have suffered much in vain, enduring as much for the sins of the Elect only, as if the sins of all men had layen on him.

11. Or else it dangerously extenuateth and denieth the sufferings of Christ, as if he did not suffer as much as was due for the sins of all and it extenuateth his love, as if he took on him only the sins of the Elect.

12. It either denieth that any but the Elect should love Christ or be thankful to him as their Redeemer (yea or any Elect that have not the knowledg of their Election) and so should not repent of the want of this love and thankfulness, or else that they should love him and be thankful for that which never was true, and never was done for them or given them.

13. It maketh God to have inflicted more on Christ then was due, even as much for the Sins of the Elect only, as was due for the Sins of all the World.

14. It leaveth all the World, Elect as well as others, without any ground and object for their first justifying Faith, and in an utter uncertainty whether they may believe to justification or not.

15. It maketh the knowledg that we have justifying Faith to go before the having of that Faith.

16. It denieth the most necessary humbling aggra-

aggravation of Mens Sins, so that neither the Minister can tell wicked Men that they have sinned against him that bought them, nor can any wicked Man so accuse himself. no nor any Man that doth not know himself to be Elect: They cannot say, my Sins put Christ to Death, and were the Cause of his sufferings: Nay a Minister cannot tell any Man in the World certainly,] thy Sins put Christ to death] because he is not certain who is Elect or sincere in the Faith.

17. It subverteth Christs new Dominion and Government of the World, and his general legislation, and Judgment according to his Law, which is now founded in his Title of Redemption, as the first Dominion and Government was on the Title of Creation.

18. It maketh all the benefits that the Non-Elect receive, whether Spiritual or corporal, and so even the relaxation of the curse of the Law (without which relaxation no Man could have such mercies) to befall Men without the satisfaction of Christ, and so either make satisfaction, as to all those mercies, needless, or else must find another Satisfier.

19. It maketh the Law of Grace to contain far harder terms then the Law of Works did in its utmost rigor.

20. It maketh the Law of *Moses* either to bind all the Non-Elect still to all Ceremonies and bondage-ordinances (and so sets up judaism) or else to be abrogated and taken down, and Men delivered from it, without Christs suffering for them.

21. It destroys almost the whole work of the Ministry, disabling Ministers either to humble

ble Men by the chiefest aggravations of their Sins, and to convince them of ingratitude and unkind dealing with Christ, or to shew them any hopes to draw them to repentance, or any love and mercy tending to Salvation, to melt and win them to the Love of Christ; or any sufficient object for their Faith and affiance, or any means to be used for pardon or Salvation, or any promise to encourage them to come in, or any threatening to deter them.

22. It makes God and the Redeemer to have done no more for the remedying of the misery of most of faln mankind, then for the Devils, nor to have put them into any more possibility of pardon or Salvation.

23. Nay it makes God to have dealt far hardlier with most Men then with the Devils; making them a Law which requireth their believing in one that never died for them, and taking him for their Redeemer that never redeemed them, and that on the meer foresight that they would not believe it, or decree that they should not; and so to create by that Law a necessity of their far sorer punishment, without procuring them any possibility of avoiding it.

24. It makes the Gospel of its own Nature to be the greatest Plague and Judgment to most of Men that receive it, that ever God sendeth to Men on Earth, by binding them over to a greater punishment, and aggravating their Sin, without giving them any possibility of remedy.

25. It maketh the case of all the World except the Elect as deplorate, remediless and hopeless, as the Case of the damned, and so denieth them to have any day of Grace, Visitation or Salvati-

Salvation, or any price for happiness put into their Hands.

26. It maketh Christ to condemn Men to Hell Fire for not receiving him for their Redeemer that never redeemed them, and for not resting on him for Salvation by his Blood, which was never shed for them, and for not repenting unto life, when they had no hope of mercy, and Faith, and repentance could not have saved them.

27. It putteth sufficient excuses into the Mouths of the condemned.

28. It maketh the torments of conscience in Hell to be none at all, and teacheth the damned to put away all their sorrows and self accusations.

29. It denieth all the privative part of those torments which Men are obliged to suffer by the obligation of Christs Law, and so maketh Hell either no Hell at all, or next to none.

30. And I shall anon shew how it leads to Infidelity and other Sins, And after this, what Face of Religion is left, unsubverted? Not that I charge those that deny Universal satisfaction with holding all these abominations, but their Doctrin of introducing them by necessary consequence: It is the opinion and not the Men that I accuse.

2. Next let me give you some express Texts of Scripture, which I shall anon run over more fully and vindicate, and see which opinion is the truth of God, *Joh.* 3. 16. *God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have everlasting Life,* 2 *Pet.* 2. 1, 20, 21. *But there were false Prophets also among the People, even*

as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable Heresies even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction, 20. 21. And as Jude hath it. 4. There are certain Men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly Men, turning the Grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ, 1 Tim. 2. 5. 6. For there is one God, and one mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a Ransom for all, to be testified in due time. 1 Joh. 2. 2. He is the Propitiation for our Sins, and not for ours only, but also for the Sins of the whole World, Rom. 5. 18. Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all Men to condemnation, Even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all Men to justification of Life, Heb. 2. 9. That he by the Grace of God should taste Death for every Man, Tit. 2. 11. For the Grace of God that bringeth Salvation, hath appeared to all Men, 1 Tim. 2. 3, 4. Who will have all Men to be saved, and to come to the knowledg of the truth, Joh. 3. 17. 18. God sent not his Son into the World to condemn the World, but that the World through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned, But he that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the Condemnation, that light is come into the World, and Men loved darkness rather then light, because their deeds were evil. 2 Cor. 5. 14, 15. For the love of Christ constraineth us, because we thus judg, that if one died for all, then were All dead: And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves,

but

but unto him which died for them, and rose again. 1 Iim. 4. 10. We trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all Men, specially of those that believe. Mat. 22. 2. 3. 4 The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a certain King, which made a Marriage for his Son. And sent forth his Servants to call them that were bidden to the Wedding, and they would not come. And he sent forth other Servants, saying tell them, that are bidden, behold, I have prepared my dinner, my Oxen and Fatlings are killed, and all things are ready: Come unto the Marriage. And vers. 8. Then said he to his Servants, The Wedding is ready, but they which were bidden were not worthy. Add vers. 12. 13. So 2 Cor. 5. 18, 19, 20, 21. And all things are of God who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the Ministry of Reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the World unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of Reconciliation. Now then we are Embassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, We pray you in Christs stead, be reconciled to God. For God made him sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him. Joh. 4. 42. This is indeed the Christ the Saviour of the World. 1 Joh. 4 14. 15. And we have seen and do testify that God sent his Son to be the Saviour of the World: Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him and he in God, 1 Joh. 5. 9. 10, 11. For this is the Witness which he hath testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the Witness in himself. He that believeth not God, hath made him a Lyar because he believeth not the Record that God gave of his Son. And this is the

Record

Record, that God hath given us Eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son: He that hath the Son, hath Life, and he that hath not the Son hath not Life. Heb. 6. 4, 5. 6. *For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the Heavenly Gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the World to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again to Repentance, seeing they crucifie to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to open shame.* Heb. 10. 26, 27. 28, 29. *For if we sin willfully after that we have received the knowledg of the Truth, there remaineth no more Sacrifice for sins, But a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the Adversaries. He that despised Moses Law, died without mercy, under two or three Witnesses: Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the Blood of the Covenant wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despight unto the Spirit of Grace,* Heb. 4. 1. 2. Let us therefore take heed lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest any of you should seem to come short of it. For unto us was the Gospel preached as well as unto them: But the Gospel preached did not profit them, not being mixed with Faith in them that heard it. *Heb. 2. 3. How shall we escape if we neglect so great Salvation,* &c. Joh. 12. 47, 48. *And if any man hear my words and believe not, I judg him not: For I came not to judg the World, but to save the World. He that rejecteth me and receiveth not my words he hath one that judgeth him: The word that I have spoken the same*

same shall judg him at the last day. Luke 13. 39. *How oft would I have gathered thy Children together as a Hen gathereth her Brood under her Wings, and ye would not. Behold your House is left unto you desolate, &c.* Mar. 16. 15. *Go ye into all the World and Preach the Gospel to every creature: He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved but he that believeth not, shall be damned.* Act. 13. 38. 39, 40, 41. *Be it known to you therefore Men and Brethren, that through this Man is preached unto you the forgiveness of Sins: And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses. Beware therefore least that come, &c. Behold ye despisers and wonder, &c. Verse. 46. Seeing ye have put it from you, and judged your selves unworthy of Everlasting Life, &c.* Mar. 18. 27, 32, 34, 35. *Then the Lord of that Servant was moved with compassion, and loosed him and forgave him the debt, &c. Then his Lord, after that he had called him said unto him, O thou wicked Servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou desiredst me, shouldst not thou also have had compassion on thy fellow Servant even as I had pitty on thee; And his Lord was wroth and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him. So likewise shall my Heavenly Father do also unto you if ye from your Hearts forgive not every one his Brother their Trespasses.* Joh. 6. 51. *I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven: If any Man eat of this Bread he shall live for ever: And the Bread that I will give is my Flesh which I will give for the Life of the World. So verse 33. 34, 35.* Joh. 1. 29. *Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the Sin of the World* 1 Cor. 15. 21, 22. *For as by Man came Death, by Man came also the Resurrection of*

the Dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. Rom. 14. 15. *Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died,* 1 Cor. 8. 11. *And through thy knowledg shall thy weak Brother perish, for whom Christ died?* Heb. 9. 15. 16. *And for this cause he is the Mediator of the new Testament, that by means of Death, for the Redemption of the transgressions under the first Testament, they which are called might receive the promise of Eternal inheritance. For where a Testament is, there must also of necessity be the Death of the Testator.* Col. 1. 20. *And having made peace through the Blood of his Cross by him to reconcile all things unto himself by him, whether they be things in Earth or things in Heaven.* Col. 2. 14. *Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his Cross,* Act. 3. *last unto you first, God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.* Hos. 7. 13. *Though I have redeemed them, yet they have spoken lies against me. Destruction to them,* &c. Isa. 53. 6. *He laid on him the iniquity of us all,* Rom. 14. 9. *For to this end Christ both died, rose and revived that he might be Lord both of the Dead and of the living.* Isa. 45. 21, 22. *There is no God else beside me, a just God and a Saviour, there is none beside me, look unto me and be ye saved all the ends of the Earth,* Joh. 1. 7. *The same came for a Witness to bear Witness of the Light, that all Men through him might believe,* See 1 Cor. 10. 1. 2. to the 13th. John 3. 17. *And as* Moses *lifted up the Serpent in the Wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have Eternal Life,* Rev. 22. 17. *Whosoever*

soever will, let him take the water of Life freely, Col. 2. 28, whom we Preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus, John 5. 22, 23, 26, 27, 28. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father, &c. For as the Father hath Life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have Life in himself, and hath given him Authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of Man. Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in which all that are in the Graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good to the Resurrection of Life, and they that have done evil to the Resurrection of Damnation, Acts 3. 22, 23. A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your Brethren like unto me, him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you, and it shall come to pass that every Soul that will not hear that Prophet shall be destroyed from among the People, Luke 20. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18. Then said the Lord of the Vineyard what shall I do? I will send my beloved Son, it may be they will reverence him when they see him, &c. The Stone which the Builders rejected is become the head of the Corner, whosoever shall fall upon that stone shall be broken, but on whomsoever it shall fall it will grind him to Powder 1 Cor. 6. 20. And ye are not your own, ye are bought with a Price, therefore glorifie God in your Body and in your Spirit, which are Gods, Deut. 32. 4, 5, 6. They have corrupted themselves, their spot is not the spot of his Children, they are a perverse and crooked Generation, do you thus requite the Lord, O foolish People and unwise? is not he thy Father that hath bought thee? hath he not

made thee and established thee? ver. 15. Then he forsook God that made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his Salvation, see Psal. 78. throughout ver. 35, 36. They remembred that God was their Rock, and the high God their Redeemer, nevertheless they flattered him with their mouth, and lyed unto him with their tongues, for their heart was not right with him, neither were they stedfast in his Covenant, but he being full of compassion forgave their iniquity, &c. Isa. 63. 8, 9, 10, He said, surely they are my People, Children that will not lye; so he was their Saviour, in all their afflictions, he was afflicted, and the Angel of his presence saved them in his love and in his pity he redeemed them, and he bare them and carried them all the days of old, but they rebelled and vexed his Holy Spirit, wherefore he was turned to be their Enemy, and fought against them, see Rom. 10. 6. to the 14th. Acts 13. 23. 26. 32. Of this Mans Seed God according to his promise hath raised unto Israel a Saviour Jesus. Men and Brethren, Children of the stock of Abraham, and who ever among you feareth God, to you is the word of this Salvation sent, and we declare unto you glad tidings, &c. see ver. 38, 39, 40, 46. before cited: And compare this with Luke 1. 67, 68, 69, &c. Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he hath visited and redeemed his People, and hath raised up an horn of Salvation for us in the House of his Servant David, &c. Mat. 25. throughout.

Mat. 28. 19, 20. All Power is given to me in Heaven and Earth, go ye therefore and Preach, &c. Acts 10. 36. 43. And this contains power to forgive Sins, Mat. 9. 6. So that you see what the Scripture saith to this point.

2. And

3. And then there is neither one Text of Scripture, nor one solid Reason against it, nor any ill consequence at all that followeth on it.

1. There is not one Text of Scripture that saith Christ died not for all, or Christ dyed only for his Chosen, or any thing equivalent. The Texts commonly alledged, are, John 17. 9. *I pray for them, I pray not for the World,* 19. *and for their sakes I sanctifie my self,* Joh. 10, 11, *The good Shepherd giveth his Life for his Sheep,* Rom. 8. 32. *He that spared not his Son, but gave him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things,* 1 Cor. 5. 18. *God was in Christ reconciling the World unto himself, not imputing to them their Trespasses,* Rom. 5. 8, 9, 10. *For if when we were Enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life,* John 11. 51, 52. *That Jesus should dye for that Nation, and not for that Nation only, but that also he should gather together in one the Children of God that were scattered abroad,* Mat. 1. 21. *for he shall save his People from their Sins,* Joh. 15. 13. *Greater Love hath no man than this, that a man to lay down his life for his friends,* 1 John 3. 16. *Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us,* Rom. 8. 34. *who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that dyed, yea rather, &c.* 1 Pet. 3. 18. *Christ hath once suffered for Sin, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God,* 1 Pet. 1. 18, 19. *knowing that you are not redeemed with corruptible things, as Silver and Gold from your vain conversation, received by Tradition from your Fathers, but with the precious blood of Jesus Christ,*

1 Pet. 2. 29. *He bore our sins on the Tree, that we being dead to sin should live to Righteousness*, Tit. 2. 14. *That he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purifie to himself a peculiar People zealous of good works*, Eph. 5. 25, 26. *Even as Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it that he might present it to himself a glorious Church not having spot or wrinkle*, &c. Isa. 53. 11. *By his knowledge shall my righteous Servant justifie many, for he shall bear their iniquities*, John 17. 2. *Thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give Eternal Life to as many as thou hast given him*, Mat. 7. 23. *Depart from me, I never knew you*, &c. Heb. 9. 28. *Christ was once offered to bear the Sins of many*, &c. Heb. 10. 14. *For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified*, Psal. 16 9. *Their drink offerings of blood will I not offer, nor take up their name into my lips*, Gen. 3. 15. *The Seed of the Woman shall break the Serpents head, and his seed bruise her heel*, Mat. 11. 25. *I thank thee O Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth, because thou hast hid these things from the Wise and Prudent, and hast revealed them to Babes*, Eph. 1. 7. *In whom we have Redemption through his blood the forgiveness of sins*, 2 Cor. 5. 21. *For he made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.*

These are all the Texts that at present I can remember, or find used by those that write against Universal Redemption, which have any considerable shew of a proof. of all which there is not one that excludeth the *Non-Elect*, nor any in the World from being the Persons for whom Christ dyed, as we shall see when we come to review them more particularly.

Not

Nor is there any ill consequence following the Doctrine of *Universal Satisfaction*, but all that terrifies men from it, is seeming ill Consequences for want of right understanding it: most men think (who go that way) that *Universal Redemption* is inconsistent with absolute Election, and with special differencing Grace, and with Christs special intention of calling and saving his Chosen, whereas indeed it is so far from being inconsistent, that it is necessarily concomitant and supposed, and they may as well think that Universal Creation is inconsistent with Election and special grace. Indeed God hath in admirable wisdom laid Universal Grace as a ground work, and built special grace (as to the executive part) thereupon, and to deny the Universal Common grace, is to destroy the ground-work of special grace. If this were well understood, there would few sober Divines be against Universal Redemption, and therefore I still say, that it is a clear explication that must do more here (and is more needful) than argumentation. Yet because some do so importunately call for Arguments I have given these Thirty (and might add many more) and shall now proceed to those that are drawn from particular Texts of Scriptures having first laid down one or two more general considerations from the Scripture Language in this particular.

That Election and Redemption are not of the same extent, and not all Elected that are Redeemed, but Redemption is Universal, and Election special may be strongly evinced by com-

paring together the language of the Scripture, concerning one and the other, how *differently* it speaks.

1. We find God charging Men to give all diligence to make sure their Calling and Election, 2 *Pet.* 1. 10. But not one word in all the Scripture to command or perswade Men to make sure that they are redeemed (unless we meant it not of the price, but the fruits :) *Paul* saith to his Converts, 2 *Cor.* 13. 5. *Examine your selves whether you be in the Faith, know ye not your own selves that Jesus Christ is in you except ye be Reprobates?* But he never bid any man, examine thy self whether thou be redeemed, or whether Christ dyed for thee? or whether thou be one of those for whom Christ dyed? we have marks given in Scripture to know by, whether we are the Children of God or no? whether sanctified, justified, pardoned, or no, but never a mark laid down in Scripture to know by, whether we are of those that Christ dyed for; no more than there is to know whether we are of those that God Created. And would not the perfect holy word of God have given marks of this, or bid men make sure of this, and try it if it were needful, and were not unquestionable because universal.

2. We find the Saints (as *David*) complaining of God's hiding his face, and seeming their Enemy, and writing bitter things against them, and groaning under that burthen of Sin, and crying for Pardon, and saying God had forsaken and forgotten them, *&c.* But we never find any Man good or bad (that believed Gods word to be true) to doubt whether Christ dyed for him, or whether he were Redeemed, or complaining

plaining of his danger for want of a Redeemer, or Expiatory Sacrifice.

3. We find God ordinarily saying of Christ Jesus, that he is the Saviour of the World, and came not to condemn the World, but to save the World, and took away the sins of the World, and is a propitiation for the sins of the whole World, and dyed for all, tasted death for every man, and was a ransom for all, *&c.* But we have no one word in Scripture that saith he predestinated all to Salvation, or decreed to save the whole World: Nay, the very term of Election contradicteth Universality, for it is no chusing if it be all, and if some be not left.

4. We find Wicked Men condemned, and their sin aggravated for denying the Lord that bought them, 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. But never for denying the Lord that Elected them.

5. We find Christians by the Apostles warned that they destroy not their weak Brethren for whom Christ dyed; and saying, through thy knowledge shall he perish, *&c.* But he nevea saith, destroy not him (or by thy knowledge shall he perish) whom God hath Elected: but contrarily, Christ saith, *if it were possible they would deceive the very Elect.*

6. We find them that fall away described to be such as were sanctified by the blood of the Covenant, but never to be such as were Elected to Salvation. And their Sin is aggravated, as being a treading under foot the Son of God, and putting him to open shame, but not as treading under foot Gods Election. And their misery is in this, that there is no more Sacrifice for Sin, but a fearful looking for of Judgment, and

and Fire, &c. But not that there is no more Election.

7. Men are warned to see that they refuse not Christ that speaketh and threatned that they shall not escape if they neglect so great Salvation, and they shall speed worse at Judgment than *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah*: But none are so threatned for sinning against Election, nor are they warned to take heed of rejecting it; nor is it said, how shall we escape if we neglect so great a mercy as Election. Also men that unworthily receive the Sacrament are said *to eat and drink damnation to themselves, and to be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord*: But no Man that is not Elect, is said either to be the cause of his own *Non Election*, or to be guilty of abusing or rejecting his Election.

8. Also I find men warned on pain of Damnation to receive Christ as their Redeemer, Be they never so wicked, it is our office to perswade them to this; and therefore to preach the Gospel to every Creature. But we are not to command men to take God for their Elector; I may not go to all the ignorant prophane men men in the Countrey and charge them to take God for their Elector.

9. We must command all men to love Christ as their Redeemer, and be thankful to him, and in thankfulness to obey him; and we may say to them, *You are not your own, you are bought with a price, therefore glorifie God with your Bodies and Spirits for they are his.* But we cannot perswade all men to love God as their Elector or to be thankful to him for Election:

or

or to obey God because he hath chosen them.

10. We find Scripture telling us, how hardly flesh and blood will digest the Doctrine of predestination, and how they will quarrel at Gods chosing one and not another, and how God stops their mouths with an answer drawn from his absolute Lordship and Propriety over them, as the Potter over the clay, he may make them vessels of honour or dishonour, and do with his own as he list. But we never find any murmurrings of Flesh and Blood that Christ should die for one man and not for another: Nor do we find God ever acknowledging any such thing much less giving them a reason from his Absolute Dominion.

11. Besides we find God useth to give the reason why men be not saved by Christ, from their own wilfulness and rebellious rejecting him. This is the cause given why his blood is not applyed to them. But when it comes matter of Election or Non-Election, the Answer is, *Oh Man! Who art thou that disputest against God?* So that all these things laid together and considered, it seems to me clear, that Redemption is a Universal Cause, as Creation is, and not a thing proper to the Elect only, as Gods Election is; and that on this Universal Ground of Redemption, Christ is entitled the Redeemer of the World, and hath founded his *jus Dominii & imperii*, his right of Propriety and Government over all (even those *That will not that he should Reign over them,*) as God was called the Creator of the World because he Created them, and on that

that ground did found his first Title of Dominion and Empire over all the World. And that Redemption hath no more an infallible connexion to the Salvation of all the Redeemed as subsequent, than Creation hath with the Salvation of all the Created: But both Creation and Redemption as they are the means between Election and its End, have an infallible connexion with the consequent of the Salvation of the Elect.

2. It is a rule of great use, and approved generally by Divines, that when texts seem contradictory one to another, or several interpretations and opinions are contradictory indeed, that we must ever reduce uncertainties to certainties, and not contrarily certainties to uncertainties: and we must, interpret obscure texts by reducing them to the plain ones, and not the plain ones by reducing them to the obscure. This rule Dr. *Sanderson* presseth well. And *Augustine* said excellently, [Shall we deny that which is plain because we cannot comprehend that which is hid and secret? Shall we say that is not so which we see to be so, because we cannot find why it is so? *Aug. l. de bono persever. c.* 14.] O that this rule were better observed! When God telleth us as plain as can be spoken, that Christ died for and tasted death for every man, men will deny it, and to that end subvert the plain sense of the words, meerly because they cannot see how this can stand with Christs damning men, and with his special Love to his chosen. It is not hard to see the

the fair and harmonious conſiſtency: But what if you cannot ſee how two plain Truths of the Goſpel ſhould agree? Will you therefore deny one of them when both are plain? Is not that in high pride to prefer your own underſtandings before the wiſdom of the Spirit of God, who indicted the Scriptures? Should not a humble man rather ſay, doubtleſs both are true though I cannot reconcile them. So others will deny theſe plain truths, becauſe they think that [All that Chriſt died for are certainly Juſtified and Saved: For whomſoever he died and ſatisfied Juſtice for, them he procured Faith to Believe in him: God cannot juſtly puniſh thoſe whom Chriſt hath ſatisfied for, *&c.*] But doth the Scripture ſpeak all theſe or any of theſe opinions of theirs, as plainly as it ſaith that Chriſt died for all and every man? Doth it ſay, as plainly any where that he died not for all? Doth it any where except any one man, and ſay Chriſt died not for him? Doth it ſay any where that he died *only* for his Sheep, or his Elect, and exclude the Non-Elect? There is no ſuch word in all the Bible; Should not then the certain truths and the plain texts be the Standard to the uncertain points, and obſcure texts.

Alſo Divines generally make it a rule for the Interpretation of Scripture, that we muſt not leave the moſt obvious plain ſenſe of the words, without neceſſity, and clear compelling evidence; Now then let them be viewed by any unprejudiced man, and let him tell us what is the plain and obvious ſenſe of theſe foreſaid words? And for my part I ſee no neceſſity of

going

going from that plain sense. Some here will tell me, then we must say Christ is a Door, a Way, a Vine, and the Bread is his Body, &c. But this is nothing to what I am speaking of: For I did never say that we must take the literal sense in opposition to the figurative, but only the plain obvious sense in opposition to a wyer-drawn extorted sense. Some figurative speeches are so usual, or plain and well known, that he that should interpret them literally would be derided by any Plowman: And every ignorant man useth figurative speeches in his common talk, and use makes the true sence as plain and obvious as if they were not figurative. You can scarce hear three sentences from any Countryman, but will convince you of this. If any man of common reason had heard Christ say; [*I am the way to the Father*] would he have thought his plain obvious sense to be [I am an Earthly or other Material way to be trodden on by the Feet of them to come to God?] What will not the lust of contradicting persuade men to? Now I would know of any man, would you believe that Christ died for all men if the Scripture plainly speak it? If you would, do but tell me, what words can you devise or would you wish more plain for it than are there used; Is it not enough that Christ is called the Saviour of the World? You'l say, but is it of the whole World? Yes, it saith, He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole World? Will you say, but it is not for All men in the World; yes it saith he died for All men, as well as for all the World. But will you say, it saith not for every man? Yes that it doth, he tasted

tasted death for every man. But you may say, It means all the Elect, if it said so of any Non-Elect I would believe. Yes, it speaks of those that denied the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And yet all this seems nothing to men prejudiced.

3. Furthermore, it deserves consideration, whether men can considerately go against the plain light of so many express Texts of Scripture without some reluctancy and regret of Judgment? And then, whether using a mans Judgment to such a course, to bear down the evidence of of many express texts of Scripture, be not a matter of a dangerous nature, both symptomatically and effectually. Doth it not signifie a defect in our belief of the truth of Scripture? Or at least of our reverend esteem of it, when we dare use it as a Leaden rule, and Nose of Wax (as the Papists presumptuously call it.) He that can think it will endure such bending, is in danger of thinking it may endure breaking. Hath it not too plain a tendency to infidelity and disobedience? It is the truth of this word that must preserve us from both. And he that thinks so meanly of the Scripture, as that it will patiently endure such violence and stretching, is in great danger of being drawn to question whether it be Gods Word or no, and of venturing over its bounds in practicals, in case of temptation. For what have we to persuade us that Christ is the eternal God but plain Scripture? And is it plainer in this than in its affirming that Christ died for All? All tender conscionable Christians should be as fearful to adventure

venture against the plain meaning of Scripture in the matter of Faith, as to adventure against its plain precepts and prohibitions in matter of practice. And therefore I conclude that when God saith so expressly that Christ died for All, and tasted death for every man, and is the Ransom for all and the propitiation for the sins of the whole World, It beseems every Christian rather to explain in what sense Christ died for All men, then flatly to deny it.

The first text of Scripture ordinarily used, and which I shall insist on, is *Joh.* 3. 16. *God so loved the World that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life.* Here it is plainly expressed that the giving of Christ proceeded from Gods Love to the World as the principal efficient, and that it was to this end, that whosoever of this World believe in him should be saved. One would think all were plain here, yet men have found or made almost as many knots as words. If a King had his whole Army prove false to him and turn to the Enemy; and when they are in his power the Enemy Imprisoneth them, and maketh them Slaves, in this misery the King saith of them [I so love my Army that I give so much money or my own Son in Ransom, that whosoever will thankfully accept my kindness, and return to his Allegiance, shall not remain in slavery but be delivered fully into my favour and their dignities] would not ordinary men easily understand this speech? Would so many doubts be raised, whether he mean the whole Army or part? What is meant by [Love] by [Whosoever]

ver] &c. yet here we have such a dust raised in as plain a case, or as plain words as such Divine mysteries could well be expressed by.

1. It is doubted what is meant by [the World.]

2. And then what is meant by [Loved.]

3. And what is meant by [Whosoever.]

The 4. What is meant by [Believeth in him] we need not here stand on.

And for the first some say by the World, is meant the Elect part of the World: some say (as Dr. *Twiss* and others) it is meant of Mankind as distinct from Angels, excluding none, and not of the Elect only; and withal that it speaks only of the sufficiency of Christ's Satisfaction; which if it were not sufficient for All, there were no place for the General Promise, *Whoever believeth shall be Saved.* There is more truth and soundness in this exposition, than will stand with some other contradictory passages in the same Authors. For my part I stand to this exposition of Dr. *Twiss* (as you may find him industriously explaining this text, *Vindic. Grat. lib.* 1. *part.* 2. § 7. *pag.* (*mihi*) 203.) I will repeat part of his words, [*Ad locum illum* (*Joh.* 3. 16.) *quod attinet, negamus ex his evinci posse* [*Mundum*] *eo in loco significare* [*Electos*] *in mundo degentes. Ad cujus loci majorem elucidationem, observandum est cum decrevisset Fidem & Resipiscentiam electis suis non modo concedere, sed & easdem modo naturæ ipsorum rationali convenientissimo, nempe per* Suasionem *& exhortationem in ipsis operari & consequenter Evangelium sub generali invitationis formâ proponendum esse in hunc modum* [*Quisquis credideris, salvus erit: qui non, damnabitur*]

hinc evincitur volentis Mediatoris duplicem Deo habendam fuisse rationem, alteram Pretii; alteram Efficaciæ Nam & Pretium oportuit sufficiens esse redimendis omnibus; alias enim tam generali promissioni [quisquis crediderit salvus erit] locus nullus fuisset: & rursus oportuit efficax esse redimendis electis: alias enim frustra fuissent constituti ad obtinendam salutem per Jesum Christum, si salutem per Christum non fuissent assecuturi. His hunc in modum constitutis, apparet fieri posse ut quædam loca Scripturæ de Christo mediatore tractent, quoad pretii ipsius sufficientiam, alia vero quoad mortis ejus efficaciam. Locum autem hunc de quo agimus existimo, significare tantum pretii ipsius sufficientiam. Ratio est quia agit, non de efficacia Spiritus sancti, in danda hominibus fide, sed de modo quo fides dari solet, nempe per predicationem Evangelii & Generalem omnium invitationem ad fidem in hanc formam [Quisquis credit in Christum, non peribit, sed habet vitam æternam] Hujus autem invitationis Generalis fundamentum, est pretii a Christo soluti sufficientia. Atque hic rursus sese in gerit φιλανθρωπια τοῦ θεοῦ, peculiaris divinæ clementiæ propensio in genus humanum, quod scilicet pro peccatis humani generis pretium sufficiens solutum iri voluit non autem pro peccatis Angelorum.

For the better understanding of this, it must be remembred that there is a double efficacy of Christs death.

1. Its satisfying God's Justice for the Sins which Christ bore.

2. The effecting of Pardon, Justification, Sanctification, and Salvation of Sinners. It is only of this latter that solid Divines speak, when they

they distinguish the efficacy of Christ's death from its sufficiency: But the former (the effecting of satisfaction) is presupposed to the sufficiency (as being the proper immediate end of Christ's death) for there is a double sufficiency.

First, a sufficiency material, antecedent to satisfaction (passive as we may call it) by which it is said to be sufficient to satisfie God for all Men.

Secondly, A sufficiency of this price and satisfaction so made for the pardoning and saving of all that will believe. It is the latter sufficiency which is to be distinguish'd from the latter efficiency, and that implies some efficiency as necessary to that sufficiency, viz. The efficiency of satisfaction. And the Doctor can be understood no otherwise here than according to this interpretation.

1. Because he makes it the necessary ground of the general promise, without which it could have no place. Now leave out the efficiency of satisfaction to Justice from Christ's death, and it is no more a ground for an Universal promise, than if he had not paid a satisfaction materially sufficient at all: For it is not sufficient to pardon all men, if they did believe, except Justice be first satisfied for them.

2. He expressly makes it to be *sufficientia pretii*, and not *ut sic pretium*, (though I know elsewhere he contradicts that.)

3. He makes it the interpretation of those Scriptures that speak of Christs dying for all, which cannot be if he satisfy'd not for all.

4. He makes a general promise and invitation to be grounded on it: But surely Christ is not with his Salvation given so much as conditionally to any but whom by satisfying for them he hath purchased that mercy to.

5. Yea he expresly in his Reason shews, that by the efficacy of Christs death, he means that which consisteth in the Spirits efficacy in working Faith.

Others say, that by [the World] is meant only the Elect, but not as Elect, but as they are *Gentiles* who are called the World in contradistinction to the *Jews*. This cannot be true, for

First, Then no Elect *Jews* should be included, but it should run thus, *God so loved the Gentiles, that he gave his only Son*, &c.] whereas Christ was sent to *Jews* as well as *Gentiles*, and that first in some respects.

Secondly, This way crosseth themselves also, for the *Gentiles* consist of Elect and non-Elect, and therefore according to their Doctrine it should only run thus [*God so loved part of the World*] if the *Gentiles* be the World, or else they must say, that by [the World] is meant the Elect part of the *Gentiles*. But I shall prove further that this is false, by proving that it includeth the Non-Elect also. By [the World] it is evident is not meant the containing World, the Air, Earth, &c. Nor Angels, or unknown Superiour Creatures, nor yet brute Beasts, but the Men living on Earth. It is granted that the usual obvious sense of words is not to be denied without evident cause, and when there is cause of denying that sense, we must go but to

the

the next obvious and usual sense, and not to a remote unusual improbable one. Now it is known that the word [World] used for Men, doth most directly and obviously signifie Mankind in general, without excluding any. Next to that it signifieth the greater part or common sort of the World. Next that it signifieth the generality or greater part of some Country where the speaker then is; not to speak of more remote significations. If therefore we be forced to forsake the first signification, it must be proved that we are also forced from the second before we must take the third, and both second and third must be disproved, before we can take the World for the Elect only.

2. The effects of that love, and giving of Christ here mentioned, are undoubtedly such as are given to all, and not only to the Elect (as to the Tenor of the Law or Deed of Gift, they are given to all Mankind, and as to the promulgation, they are given to all those that hear the Gospel.) Therefore the World here mentioned is all, and not only the Elect. I think none will deny the Consequence, and for the Antecedent, it is evident through all the Scripture as well as this Text. The effect of the giving of Christ here expressed, is the conditional gift of Salvation: But the conditional gift of Salvation is to all, and not only to the Elect, *Ergo*, &c. [*That whosoever believeth in him should not perish*] is a plain giving of Salvation on condition of believing; it being usual in Scripture and common speech, to make [whosoever will] and [if you will] equally conditionally. *Whosoever will, let him take the water of Life freely*, is equi-

valent to this [it shall be yours if you will take it.] If you beat up the Drum for Souldiers, you proclaim [whosoever will come to such a place and list himself under such a Commander, shall have Entertainment and Pay,] here [whosoever will come and list himself,] is equivalent to [if any or all of you will come and list your selves] So that where they put the question, whether the word [whosoever] be distributive? I answer, no, not directly, it is but the universal extension of the Conditional Promise, with an expression of the conditionality; but consequently it is distributive, though Antecedently and directly it be not. As in the former Comparison, when you say [whosoever will list himself, &c.] the word [whosoever] is not directly distributive, for you offer all that hear you that priviledge, and all may accept it if they will, and then there would be no distribution: But because all will not, and this is foreknown, therefore consequently it is distributive. So here; and that it is distributive is from the will of Man, and the event, and other exteriour differencing Causes; but not properly from the promise or deed of gift at all, except by accident.

3. The next words shew what [World] it is that is here spoken of, *viz.* That which comprizeth men that believe, and so are not Condemned; and those that believe not (which Consideration is consequential, and not antecedent to Christ's dying for them) and so are Condemned already, because they have not believed, *&c. v.* 18. They that will affirm a greater restriction in the sense of the word, must prove it.

it. For (though I have proved here the larger sense) yet indeed it belongs to them to prove their assertion, who recede from the commoner and more extensive sense. I shall briefly examine what they say to that end.

Only I must intreat the Reader, that if they compare my Writings with any Book which contains the Reasons which I confute, that you would not expect that I should take any notice of any of those strangely-confident, Juvenile, Triumphant Expressions which some do abound with, but that I draw out only the pith of their Arguments, and set Reason against Reason, and let the heaps of Worldly Rhetorical Gloryings alone: Much more must I expect that you will not take me to be engaged to defend any *Arminian* misinterpretations and weaknesses, and to confute what any man saith against them, but only that which seems of force against the interpretations or assertions that I my self do maintain.

The first Reason they give for proving that it is only the Elect that here are called the World, is drawn from the Love which is here said to have the World for its object, which cannot be common to all, but is proper to the Elect. This we deny, and they attempt to prove by these five Reasons.

1. Say they, it is the most transcendent and remarkable Love, and therefore proper to the Elect. I must desire the Reader to see this answered afterward in my answer to their interpretation of *John*.

2. It is an Eternal act of God's will.

Answ. But what that is to the purpose I know not.

3. It was the cause of sending Christ.

Answ. That's true, it was one cause, but how follows the consequence?

4. They say that Love which is the cause of giving Christ, is always the cause of bestowing all other good things.

Answ. That Love which caused the giving of Christ for the Elect, is the cause of giving them all things with him; but that love which caused the giving of Christ for all, shall not eventually give them all things. I refer you to what I shall say anon to *Rom.* 8. 32. for the full answer to this.

5. They say this Love is an assured Fountain of Salvation to all that are beloved with it.

Answ. I deny it. if they mean by [assured] such as shall eventually be saved; but, say they, the issue of this Love being *not perishing but obtaining Eternal Life*, happens only to the Elect, *Ergo, &c.*

Answ. The Text speaks of no other effect of this Love, but the giving of Christ, and the giving of Eternal Life on Condition of believing. Now for the former, there is a twofold giving of Christ; First, giving him on the Cross for us. Secondly, Giving him in the word of Promise to us.

The Text seems to comprehend both. He is given on the Cross for all, he is given in the word conditionally to all, and so is Eternal Life with him.

Now, though the actual right to Eternal Life and fruition of it be not the portion of all, yet that

that makes no alteration or differencing nature in this Universal Conditional promise, it is because one believed, and another did not. The Promise antecedently to the performance or non-performance of the Condition, gave Christ alike to the Elect, and non-Elect, and Life with him. But that some believed rather than others, was not from the gift of this Universal Conditional Promise, but from another cause, even Gods secret decree of Election.

Their second Reason for proving that by [the World] is meant only the Elect, is because it is the same World that Christ came to save, *ver.* 17. but that is only the Elect, else God should fail of his intention.

Answ. This is to pervert one Text by perverting another, as I shall shew anon, when we come to that Text.

Their Third Reason is, that its usual to call the Elect the [World.]

Answ. It was a very Pious Judicious Grave Divine that said [I profess I cannot find any one clear place where [the World] must of necessity be taken for the Elect only. *Ezek. Culverwell* in his Answer to Objections against his Treaty of Faith.]

They alledge for what they say these Texts, *John* 4. 42. where Christ is called *the Saviour of the World*, a Saviour of Men not saved, is strange.

Answ. So are all things strange to Men till they understand them. It's no more strange than that God Created all Men to Life (that Happiness which the first Covenant promised) who yet did dye for Sin.

The

The Second is *John* 6. 33, 57. which shall be vindicated anon.

The Third is *Rom.* 4. 13. *Abraham* is said by Faith to be Heir of the World, which *ver.* 11. is called to be [the Father of the Faithful.]

Answ. A bold interpretation, but here's no proof, nor appearance of any that the Father of the faithful is all one with (Heir of the World) is too unlikely a thing to be received on a Mans bare word: Especially considering that it is proper to *Abraham* to be (Father of all them that believe) *verse.* 11. But to be Heir of the World, *verse* 13. is not proper to him: For it is said, (the promise, that he should be Heir of the World, was not to *Abraham* or to his Seed, through the Law.) I never read where *Abraham* is called (Heir of the Faithful) nor can he so be conveniently called: But he is called Heir of the World: Therefore by the World is not meant only the Faithful.

The Next is *Rom.* 11. 12: *If the fall of them be the Riches of the World, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles,* &c.]

Anf. It is more than the Elect Gentiles that shall be and are enricht by Christ (though not as the Elect) others are enriched with that Church state visible, which *Paul* here speaks that the *Jews* were broken off from: As also with the Gospel, and ordinances, and conditional gift of Christ and justification and glory; besides many other mercies. The next Text cited to prove that the [World] is put only for the Elect is *Col.* 1.6. [Which Gospel] *is come unto you, as it is in all the World, and bringeth forth fruit, as it doth also in you.* &c.

Anf.

Anſ. 1. It is not ſaid, that it bringeth forth fruit in all the World, but that it is come into all the World, and bringeth forth Fruit, *viz.* in ſome where it comes.

2. But ſuppoſe it were otherwiſe, doth not Chriſt ſay, that the Goſpel doth bring forth fruit in more than the Elect, *viz.* in many that fall away when Perſecution ariſeth? *Mat.* 13. And in whom the cares of the World do choak that Fruit.

3. Were theſe *Coloſ.* all Elect to whom *Paul* ſpeaks?

4. It is a known truth that the Goſpel comes to more than the Elect; for many are called, but few choſen; next they alledge 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. which makes ſufficiently againſt their whole cauſe as ſhall be ſhewen anon, when we come to it. Another place cited by them is, 1 *Joh.* 2. 2. Chriſt is the propitiation of the ſins of the whole World.

Anſ. If they may thus beg the queſtion, all Texts ſhall mean as they would have them. Of this anon. Another place cited is *Pſal.* 22. 27. *All the ends of the World remember and turn unto the Lord: And all the Kindreds of the Nations ſhall worſhip before thee: For the Kingdom is the Lord's, and he is the Governour among the Nations.*]

Anſ. 1. [All the ends of the World] is not ſo large as [all the World.]

2. It is plain that this Text ſpeaks of the eſtabliſhment of Chriſts viſible Kingdom, which contains more than the Elect. The Net of the Goſpel brings Fiſhes good and bad. The Heathen Countries that have turned to the Lord from Paganiſm and Infidelity, have not all believed to Salvation. The Kingdoms of the

World

World shall become the kingdom of the Lord and of his Christ: But they are not all Elect.

These are all the Texts that I find urged to to prove that by the World is signified only the Elect.

2. And what if it were so in some places?

1. It follows not that it is so here.

2. The usual Sense must not be forsaken without cause: Nor is it sufficient that unusually it is otherwise taken.

3. The conjoyned words will shew the necessity of a restrained Sense, where such a Sense is necessary to be received; but so they do not here, but contrarily, as hath been shewed.

Their 4th. Reason to prove that by the [World] is here meant [the Elect only] is this. If every one in the World be intended, why doth not the Lord in the pursuit of this Love reveal Christ to all so loved?

Ans. This is to be fully answered anon among the main Objections, by it self.

Lastly, they say, else all these will follow.

1. That some are beloved and hated also from Eternity.

2. That God's Love towards innumerable is fruitless and vain.

3. That the Son of God is given to them that never hear word of him, and have no power granted to believe in him.

4. That God is mutable in his Love, or else he still loveth those that be in Hell.

5. That he gives not all things to them to whom he gives his Son.

6. That he knows not certainly before, who shall believe and be saved.

Ans.

Anſ. To the firſt I thought no *Antiarminian* Divine ever denied it. God hateth all the Workers of iniquity, *Pſal.* 5. 5. You will not ſay, that he hated them not from Eternity: Many of the Workers of iniquity are Elect, and ſo loved from Eternity. God's Love is ſpoken, ſay Divines, *ab effectu, potius quam ab affectu.* God from Eternity ſo loved Men, not Elect, as to give them on Creation Everlaſting Life in *Adam*, on condition of fulfilling the firſt Covenant; and to give them everlaſting life in Chriſt on condition of believing according to the ſecond Covenant: And yet he decreed not to give any Men Grace to perform the condition of the firſt covenant; nor to give all men Grace to perform the condition of the ſecond.

To the 2d. Conſequence I ſhall anſwer fully by it ſelf anon among the contrary Arguments.

To the 3d. alſo I ſhall there anſwer.

To the 4th. I ſay (for it is not worth a fuller anſwer.)

1. All Divines that I know ſay that God loveth thoſe in Hell, as his Creatures and as Men: *Aquinas* and the reſt of the Schoolmen have it frequently: Yea *Urſine*, *Rob. Baronius* and many of our Proteſtant Divines ſay, that he puniſheth thoſe in Hell ſhort of their deſerving, and ſo ſheweth ſome mercy there; that I will not meddle with.

2. If you ſpeak of God's Love as it is *in effectu* and not *in affectu*, then it is certainly mutable. He gives Men thoſe mercies, which for their abuſe he removeth or turneth to judgments. He gives to all a conditional Pardon, and Life: And after condemneth moſt to Death for not performing

forming the condition. To the Elect themselves these Effects are changeable.

3. If you say, God's Love is but his *Velle bonum alicui*; and therefore he cannot be said now Men are in Hell to continue to will them a conditional Pardon and Life: Therefore God's Love must be mutable. I answer, Let those Owls that love to blind themselves by gazing on the Sun of God's undiscernable Infiniteness, undertake to tell what God's Love is, and what his Will is, and how he Wills that which is past, &c. For my part I pretend not to a capacity of discerning any such things.

2. You may enforce your objection as strongly concerning God's Love to the Elect: He once willed their Creation, then he willed to redeem them by Christ, then he willed to call them, and to give them their first justification, to deliver them from this sickness and that danger, then he willed that they should die, and then that they should rise again: If you will tell me how God after the Resurrection, will continue to all Eternity, to will to create Man, to redeem him, to call him, justifie him, deliver him, raise him, &c. then I will tell you how God will Eternally will the giving Christ Pardon and Salvation conditionally to all. If you say, he Wills them as *preterita*, and not as *presentia vel futura*; you may say so by this. If you say, that there is no *preteritum vel futurum* with God, but all present, and therefore he willeth them as *preterita sic dicta quoad hominem vel fidem mensuram humanam, sed ut presentia quoad Deum*; the like you may say here also.

To

To the 5th. Consequence I must answer anon by it self when we speak of their Argument from *Rom.* 8. 32.

To the 6th. It is a naked affirmation, as easily denied. Dare Men say, that it was no mercy or love of God, to give mankind in *Adam* Eternal Life on condition of keeping his Law, because God foreknew or foredecreed, they would not or should not keep it? And so not attain the fruit of that Govenant thereby? Dare these Men (pretending to preach the Gospel) tell their hearers, that to all of them (except the Elect) the preaching, the Gospel (and therein the offer and conditional gift of Christ, Pardon, Justification and Salvation is no mercy, nor from any love of God to them? And so that in rejecting it they never were guilty of rejecting or sinning against any love or mercy?

Having examined what they say, to prove that by [the World] is meant [the Elect only] I find it needless to examine the rest about the Sense of the word [loved] and [whosoever] partly because what they say requires not much confutation, and partly because enough is said on occasion of this. I affirm that by love is not meant a meer natural affection, nor yet a meer Act: (But if we must speak of God after the manner of Men) it is an Act proceeding from the goodness of God's nature. And I deny not this Act to be free: And therefore take not natural, For,

Physical (as if God loved us as the Fire burned, *quantum in se*)

2. Nor

2. Nor yet Constrained: And it must be observed, that both the Text, and those that thus interpret it, speak only of God's Love to Mankind or the World, and not directly to the [Salvation of the World.] The conditional gift of Salvation to the World is the Effect of that love to the World; and it is true love, though it infallibly procure not that Salvation.

And for the other words [whosoever believeth] as I have said before, they are primarily and directly the conditional expression, and to all: But secondarily and accidentally distributive, because all perform not the condition. So *Rom.* 10. 13. Whosoever shall call on the Name of the Lord shall be saved: Which *verse* 9. is conditionally thus expressed [if thou believe and if thou confess] and *verse* 11. It is put in equipollent terms, *whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed.* So *Rom.* 9. 33. *Joh.* 11. 26. *Act.* 10. 43. *Whosoever believeth in him shall receive Remission of Sins. Act.* 2. 21. *Joh.* 12. 46. *Mar.* 10. 15. *Mar.* 8. 34, 38. *Mat.* 18. 4. and 5. 19, 21, 22, 28. and 10. 14, 32, 33, 42.

The 2d. Text that I shall alledg, is the next *Verses, Joh.* 3. 17, 18, 19. *For God sent not his Son into the World to condemn the World, but that the World through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned, but he that believeth not is condemned already; because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that Light is come into the World, and Men loved darkness rather than Light, &c.*]

1. Here

Here 1. It is expresly said that Christ came into the World, that the World by him might be saved: And therefore he died for them.

2. Yet this World is distributed into such as believe and are not condemned, and such as believe not and are condemned: And therefore it is not only the Elect.

3. This condemnation is for not believing; which, as I have proved, presupposeth Christ's dying for them.

Now let us see what they bring to prove that by the World here is meant only the Elect. They tell us here of a notable ἀντανακλασις, as if by the Word [World] were meant several things, when here repeated: But for proof of what they say, you must take their words. Is it not good Sense and true to say [*God sent not his Son into the World,*] *viz.* into the World of mankind, or among Men, [*to condemn the World*] *viz.* of Mankind [*but that the World*] of Mankind [*through him might be saved.*] But what if their various acception were granted? Still the World that Christ was sent to save, is divided into Believers eventually saved, and Unbelievers eventually condemned. If this be denied, the next words annexed are so clear, that I desire the Reader, but without prejudice, to consider them, and use no violence with his judgment in expounding them. Their Reasons for their Sense are these.

1. Because all are not saved: And the Lord hath said he will do all his pleasure, and his purpose shall stand.

Ans. 1. He will do all that he is pleased to do: But not all that he is pleased to command Man to do: Nor all that he is pleased

to promise to Man on certain conditions, when those conditions are not performed. His purpose shall undoubtedly stand: But when will it be proved that God did purpose or resolve eventually, and actually to save that World that is here meant? As God hath a Will *de rerum eventu*, and a Will *de debito*, which I call Legislative: So each act of his Will hath its proper end (as we may ascribe any end to Gods Will, distinct from himself by improper speech.) His decreed or purposed ends he always attains (supposing them absolute: For I will not in this place touch that controversie, whether God have a conditional decretive Will *de rerum eventu*: But his Legal prescribed ends he doth not always attain. The end of his Law is the fulfiling of its conditions, and Mans attaining the reward thereby: This may be called God's end.

1. In that God prescribeth it to Man to be by him intended, and so sending Christ into the World to satisfie his justice, he hath bound the World to seek and accept Life and Salvation in and by him.

2. In that God hath made Christ and Faith to have the nature of a means, in reference to that command: And all Men are bound (that hear the Gospel) to take Christ by believing in him, as a means of Salvation provided by God.

3. Because God hath truly made to all Men a deed of gift, or a legacy of Christ and Salvation with him to all that will take him, and therefore he may well be said, to have given Christ that the World through him might be saved: Having given them Salvation in Christ they will have it.

4. He

4. He therefore giveth Christ to the World of Unbelievers, that conditionally they may be saved: That is, if they will: That is, if they will have Salvation in and with Christ. And

5. In so doing God doth all that belongs to him to do as Legislator: For it must be understood that here he speaks those words [*that the World by him might be saved*] not as absolute Lord meerly or properly, but as *Rector per Leges*. And it belongs to him as Legislator, only to propound Salvation, to Man as his end: And to promise it on his conditions, and prescribe those conditions and command Man to perform them: And to threaten him with the loss of that end (of Salvation) if he perform them not. But to give Faith, which is the condition it self, doth not belong to God as Legislator. (No Man living can claim the first Act of Faith, or effectual Grace thereto, from God by any promise that he hath made): But he giveth it as *Dominus absolutus*, and as one that may do with his own as he list. So that it is *Finis prescriptus & conditionaliter datus*, that is here spoken of; and not *Finis Decretus* to be by God eventually infallibly accomplished. It is the end of Gods Law, and Legislative Will, and so of God as meer Legislator or *Rector per Leges*: And not of his decretive Will *de eventu*, and of God as absolute Lord above Laws, without them disposing of his own. (The prediction of Events doth collaterally and *secundum quid* belong to his Law: But not *per se* and directly.)

And 6. Consider, that if it be never so much denied that God hath properly a conditional Will *de rerum eventu*, yet it is beyond all que-

stion true, that he hath a conditional Will *de debito*, (*officii*, *Præmii & Pœnæ*) and so his Law is contidional most commonly. He hath constituted the *Debitum præmii*, the dueness of Salvation on condition of believing, loving and sincerely obeying Christ. And therefore they must not deny conditional promises and threatnings, though they deny conditional decrees. This I add, because I know they here usually answer that God intendeth no end conditionally, but where he intendeth also the condition it self, that so it may be equivalent to absolute: But he intendeth as Legislator that Faith shall be the prescribed means to Glory, and Glory the end promised to all that perform that condition; and so conditionally giveth it.

7. Consider also that even in regard of Gods Will *de Eventu*, our Divines generally with the Schoolmen confess and maintain that God hath a conditional Will in this Sense.

That is, that he willeth such a thing shall be a condition of the accomplishing, giving or event of another thing; and so that he willeth Faith shall be a condition of Salvation: Though nothing be the condition of Gods Act of Willing. So that *ex parte voliti* it is conditional, though not *ex parte actus volentis*.

This Dr. *Twiss* saith oft consid. of *Tilenus Sinod* of *Dort* and *Arlis* reduced *Page* 61. He saith [*Ger. Vossius* interpreteth the Will of God touching the Salvation of all, of a conditional Will, thus: God will have all to be saved, to wit, in case they believe: Which conditional Will in this Sense, neither *Austin* did, nor we do deny] And *Page* 143, 144. I willingly pro-

fess

sess that Christ died for all, in respect of procuring the benefit, (of Pardon and Salvation) conditionally on condition of their Faith] and against *Cotton* p. 74 [Still you prove that which no man denieth, *viz.* that God purposed Life to the World upon condition of Obedience and Repentance, provided that you understand it right; *viz.* that Obedience and Repentance is ordained of God, as a condition of Life, not of Gods purpose.

8. And lastly, Let it be considered that Christ being man, we may the better speak after the manner of man concerning him; and so ascribe to him a Velleity, or a VVill which attains not the thing willed in a sense beyond all those senses before mentioned.

All this I have laid here together that it may serve when the like question or text falls again in our way, and so I must take leave to refer you hither. And by this may very many Scriptures be interpreted, which ascribe such Velleities and Unaccomplished willings to God: Yea were these few lines given in answer to this question well weighed, (if through partiality I over-value them not) I think they might give much light to shew the true mean in the greatest of the Arminian Controversies.

The second Reason they give, that it is the Elect only that are here meant by the VVorld, is, because the most of men were at that instant actually damned.

Did he send his Son that they might be saved?

Ans. This is anon to be answered by it self as a great argument against Universal Redemption; and I am loath to repeat one thing

oftener than needs I must. Only I say, when Christ died Millions of Men were actually saved: Did God send his Son to save them that were saved already? yes, no doubt: even to do that which he had undertaken to do presently on the fall, to pay a sufficient satisfaction for the sins of all, whether since that undertaking they be saved or damned.

Thirdly, They say, Christ was appointed for the fall of some, therefore not that all and every one might be saved, *Luke* 2. 34.

Ans. Themselves will fasten no other sense on that of *Luke* but this [God hath decreed to permit many through their own wilfulness to stumble and fall on Christ: and so he shall by accident, or as an occasion, be their ruine] Now this is no whit inconsistent with Gods ordaining him to be *per se* and directly a means for all mens Salvation, in the sense before fully opened.

4. They say, the end of God in sending Christ was not contrary to any of Gods Decrees; which were eternally fixed concerning the condemnation of some for their sins: Did he send his Son to Save such?

Ans. 1. As it is no contradiction for God to command an action, and to decree the non-futurition of that action; so it is no contradiction for God as Legislator by his Law or Testament to ordain that Salvation shall be to every man the end prescribed him when he is commanded to believe; and faith a means to that end; and to give him Salvation under his hand in his Testament on condition of believing; and to purpose accordingly that he shall be saved if he will believe; and yet at the same time either

not to Decree to give him Faith, or to Decree not to give him Faith, and consequently not actually *de eventu* to save him.

2. Do not these men know that they vent all these confident zealous insultings, directly against the Scripture expressions, as well as against ours? Doth not Christ say to *Hierusalem, How oft would I have gathered thee, as a Hen gathereth her Chickens under her Wings, and ye would not*? yet did not God decree their not being so gathered? Are you sure that all those Jews were Elected and Saved to whom *Peter* saith *Act. 3. last. To you first God sent his Son Jesus to bless you, in turning every one of you from his Iniquities*? Or rather, is it not spoken of the end of Gods Legislative Will, and so is meant of a conditional gift? God will so bless you, if you are willing, or reject it not? For by turning from Iniquity there is meant the work of Sanctification following the first act of Faith, and perhaps of Justification too. Multitudes of such expressions may be found in the Scripture, which I am loath needlessly to tire my self and the Reader with the recital of.

The third Text which I shall alledge is that of the same importance with both the former, *John 12. 47, 48. And if any man hear my words and believe not, I judge him not, for I came not to judge the World, but to save the World. He that rejecteth me and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, that same shall Judge him at the last day.* An ordinary wit would think that Christ had spoken here so plain and full as to stop the passage against all sober exceptions; For,

1. In the 46 *verse* Christ saith, I am come a Light into the World, thereby shewing that he is an Universal Cause, as the Sun is of Light, which is the same in its shining to all, though some are blind, and therefore see not by its Light, yet that is not either for want of Light in the Sun, or because it shineth differently to one and to the other, but because their Eyes are not capable of enjoying and using its Light: so is Christ as a Satisfier and as the object of justifying Faith; though *efficienter* as the Author of Faith by his Spirit, he worketh differently.

2. It is the World into which and among whom Christ is said to come as a Light.

3. The end of his coming is the conditional Illumination of all. *That whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness.*

4. This World containeth such as [hear Christs words and believe not.]

5. Lest any should have a pretence to think, that the World, which he came to be a Light to, was only the Elect, and those that believed not were no part of them, he repeateth all again more plainly, saying, he came not to judge the World but to save the World.

6. To put all out of doubt that Unbelievers were part of this World that he came to save, he addeth the causal conjunction [For] proving that, or giving it as a reason why, he would not Judge Unbelievers, because he came not to judge the VVorld (what force was in that reason, if they were none of that VVorld) but that to save the VVorld. VVas it any proof that he would not judge Unbelievers because

because he came not to judge but to save the Elect?

7. Yet that there might be no place for doubting left, he again sheweth that Unbelievers are part of this VVorld that he came not to Judge but to Save, saying, *He that rejecteth me and receiveth not my words, hath one that Judgeth him*, which is plainly opposed to the former negation, *I judge him not*, and, *for I came not to Judge the World.*

I know not what can be said against this, but the former objection, that it is only the VVorld of the Elect that Christ came to save: But I have said enough in answer to that, and shall, say more anon. As for their feigned ἀντανάκλασις, here are expressions plain enough to exclude it: and were it granted, it would do them no good; except withal they prove not only that by the VVorld, *v.* 46. is meant the Earth (which yet is unsound) but that by the VVorld in both parts of the 47. *v.* is meant only the Elect; which they will, I think, never be able to prove. And indeed their pretended ἀνταναάκλασις, doth make Christs reason to be invalid, and so contradicteth the Text.

The fourth Text to the same sense is, *Joh.* 6. 32, 33, 35, 36, 40, 51, 64, 66. compared; where note,

1. That the persons he spake to were many unbelieving murmuring Jews, yea and many of his own Disciples which yet believed not, *ver.* 60, 61, 64. that is, such as followed him and professed to be his Disciples, & yet did not heartily and firmly believe, and therefore they then went

went back and walked no more with him, v. 66.

Yet 2. Note, That to all these Christ saith, *ver.* 32. My Father *giveth you* the true Bread from Heaven. For the Bread of God is he which cometh down from Heaven and giveth Life to the World; yet *ver.* 36. he tells them, that they believe not, and *ver.* 51. *I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven. If any man eat of this Bread he shall Live forever, and the Bread that I will give is my Flesh, which I will give for the Life of the World.* Where note, not only that the gift is universal for the Life of the World; but also that he puts the giving his Flesh for the VVorld.

1. As that which he will do absolutely without any condition.

2. And which he puts in order of nature, before the second act, which is the giving his Flesh to men to eat (which is the application of the benefits of his death.)

3. And then comes their eating or not eating, and so living or not living after both these. At least it is undeniable that Christ here gives his Flesh to more than do take and eat it, even to them that believe not, but forsake him from that day. And therefore the Jews say, *ver.* 52. *How can this man give us his Flesh to eat?* Now what is said against this? The answer I find in these words in one VVriter [" That " the VVorld here cannot signifie All and Eve- " ry one, that ever were or should be, is as " manifest as if it were written with the beams " of the Sun, and that because it is made the ob- " ject of Christs intendments to purchase for " them, and bestow upon them Life and Sal-

" vation.

"vation. Now I ask, Whether any man, not "bereaved of all Spiritual and Natural sense, "can imagine that Christ in his Oblation in- "tended to purchase Life and Salvation for all "them whom he knew to be damned many ages "before? or who dares affirm once that Christ "gave himself for the Life of them, who not- "withstanding that, by his disappointment do "come short of it to eternity? so that if we had "no other place to manifest that the word "[VVorld] doth not always signifie All, but "only some of all sorts, as the Elect are, but "this one produced by our Adversaries, to the "contrary, I hope with all equitable Readers "our defence would receive no prejudice.]

Ans. If this be true, I must confess my self, bereaved of all Spiritual and Natural sense; which yet I am not willing to do, seeing by one I should confess my self no Christian, and by the other, not a man, at least to have no reason in exercise. This is a heavy charge on all the Fathers, and later Divines and Godly People that differ from this Author. Specially unless his Reasons were stronger; for I confess his Sun-beams are wholly clouded to me. His first reason is answered briefly already, and must be fully afterward by it self. The flesh of Christ was Morally given presently on the fall; before any of the VVorld was in Hell: and therefore it must be physically given on the Cross in time, according to that undertaking which was the moral gift and satisfaction.

2. His second Reason is also answered fully before, and shall be after. If Christ give Salvation to all on condition they will receive it

in

in him, then we may dare to affirm that this is the fruit of the giving himself on the Cross: may we not dare to affirm that God created all mankind in *Adam*, that they may live to him and so be blessed, (as *Ursine* and multitudes of our Divines do affirm) though yet, he knew that man would do otherwise eventually? For God commanded him to live to him, and gave him means, and promised him everlasting Happiness if he obeyed. And why may we not as well say Christ Redeemed men to Salvation, that yet for rejecting it are not saved? As shewing themselves unworthy of eternal Life. But I like not his phrase, that men come short of Salvation by Gods disappointment. Gods not giving them Faith, nor yet his adjudging Unbelievers to Death, are neither of them to be called his disappointing them of Life. But because he asks, who dare say this? let us next see whether the Holy Ghost dare not.

The fifth Text which I shall insist on is 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. *But there were false Prophets also among the People, even as there shall be false Teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable Heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And* verse 20, *&c. For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the World through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again intangled therein and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning: For it had been better for them*

them not to have known the way of Righteouſneſs, then after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them: But it is happened to them according to the true Proverb, *The Dog is turned to his own Vomit again, and the Sow that was waſhed to her wallowing in the mire.*] VVhereto for fuller explication add but *Jude*'s words of the ſame men, *ver.* 4. *Ungodly men, turning the Grace of our God into Laſciviouſneſs, and denying the only Lord God and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt,*] put all theſe together becauſe they all ſpeak of the ſame men.

Now 1. The Text expreſly ſaith, they denied the Lord that bought them.

2. That it is the Lord Jeſus that is this Lord, appears,

1. In that it is expreſly ſaid in the 20. *ver.* that it was by the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, that they eſcaped the pollutions of the VVorld.

2. *Jude* expreſly ſaith, *They denied the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.*

3. There have been few that have denied God among all Apoſtates in compariſon of thoſe that have denied Chriſt: Nay, it is a great doubt whether it can be proved of any, directly that were in thoſe times.

4. Their Apoſtacy is deſcribed by *turning from the holy Commandment delivered to them,* which is called *the way of Righteouſneſs,* and to their former Vomit (which muſt needs be the ſtate they were in before they turned Chriſtians) and to the mire, after they were waſhed; And this ſtate of Apoſtacy is oppoſed to *eſcaping the pollutions of the World, by the knowledge of the Lord*

Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, so that it is left past doubt that it is the Lord Jesus Christ that bought them whom they are said to deny. And *Jude* saith of them, that *they are twice dead, plucked up by the roots*, by which it appears that after their first death, they had received some kind of new Life by Christ.

Lastly, Note, that here are many benefits which they received, which could not have befallen them, but through the Death of Christ; They could no other way have been washed, and have escaped the worlds pollutions, and have known the way of Righteousness, *&c.* yea *Jude* saith, *They turn the Grace of God into Lasciviousness*, therefore it was a sin against Grace: and all Grace is by the blood of Christ: yea it seems they had themselves some Grace, that is, (Mercy contrary to merit and tending to a recovery) which they so turned into Lasciviousness. And *Peter* in the next chapter shews that their Apostacy lay in a not-believing Christs second coming, because of his seeming delay, and therefore they gave themselves up to their Lusts, and said mockingly, *Where is the promise of his coming?* so that it is both evident that they were purchased by Christ, and that it is Christ that bought them whom they are said to deny.

Yet as plain as the Holy Ghost hath here spoken, what industry is used to raise a Dust, and compel these words to receive an alien sense.

1. It is said that "all things for Universal "Redemption are here Uncertain: but against "it, this is certain.

1. "That

3. "That there are no spiritual distinguish-
"ing fruits of Redemption ascribed to those
"false Teachers, but only common gifts of light
"and knowledge which Christ hath purchased
"for many for whom he did not make his Soul
"a Ransom.

2. "That else the Redemption of any by the
"blood of Christ, cannot be a peculiar aggrava-
"tion of the sins of any, because they say, he
"died for all: and yet this buying of the false
"Teachers is held out as an aggravation of
"their sin in particular.

Anſ. 1. It is here meerly beg'd and never was yet proved, that Christ hath purchased common gifts of light and knowledge for men without making his Soul a Ransom, *i. e.* his Life a satisfaction for them, and that all that he satisfied for have distinguishing fruits of Redemption. It is easier to take these as certainties than to prove them so.

2. Redemption is no aggravation of that mans Apostacy, that never was an Apostate. It cannot be said, that they deny the Lord that bought them, who never denied him: And therefore it is a common aggravation of the sin of all that do sin against him, and of all their denial that do deny him; but all do not deny him. May not that be an aggravation of these mens sins in particular, which would also aggravate the sins of any other, according to the several quality of the sin? May it not be said of an Atheist, [He denieth the God that made him,] as an aggravation of his particular sin? and will you by force of Wit thence prove that God made not all men? Now to the uncertainties.

And

" And 1. They say it is uncertain whether " Christ as Mediator be here intended as Lord " or no; there is not any thing in the Text to " enforce us so to conceive.

Answ. It may enforce the unprejudiced I think; review what I have produced out of the Text to prove it. But they give these reasons against it.

1. God only, as God with his dealing toward such, is mentioned, of Christ not a word.

Answ. 1. Is not Christ God? And from this Text Divines have proved it (joined with *Jude* 4.) against the *Arrians*; and must we give up that argument for nothing? 2. I have before shewed special mention of Christ.

2. They say [the name *Κυριος* properly *Herus*, attended by Dominion and Soveraignty, is not usually if at all given to our Saviour in the new Testament, *&c.* Nay is the name proper for our Saviour in the work of Redemption? *Κυριος* is such a Lord and Master as refers to servants and subjection.

Answ. 1. I hope we must not also deny Christs Dominion and Soveraignty, and deny our selves to be his Servants and Subjects. (as he is Mediator) only that we may the better deny his Universal Sacrifice and Satisfaction: If we do, it will be a dear bought conclusion. *All power in Heaven and Earth is given to him, and the Father hath committed all judgment to him, and for that end he Died, Rose, and Revived, that he might be Lord of the Dead and Living,* Matth. 28. 19. John 5. 22. Rom 14 9.

2. It is sufficient if here it be evident that *Κυριος* is applied to Christ; seeing there is no

dissuading reason can be brought from the word. It is undoubtedly true of the reign of the Mediator, in the largest sense; (now all power is given to him) that ἡ βασιλεία αὐτῶν πάντων δεσπόζει, as it is said of God, *Psal.* 103. 19. by the Sept. *Erasmus* saith, *siquid interest Dominus privati juris nomen est, κύριος honoris & authoritatis*: And then we may see that both both belong to Christ, and yet no wonder if he be more often called κύριος.

3. If it were God the Father that is here called Lord, yet all is one to the main point, for he [redacted] *Deus Redemptor*, and he bought them by the blood of his Son, but that's the next Question.

2. They say it is uncertain that by [buying] is meant purchasing with the ransom of his blood.]

Answ. 1. What other price than Christs blood doth God buy men with?

2. I have proved it before, that it was purchasing with Christ's blood; both in that *Jude* mentioneth the Lord Jesus Christ (and some think that the former Title (the only Lord God) is given of Christ too, and the place invincible to prove Christs Godhead;) and in that the benefits received by them could come no other way. But let us see their Reasons.

1. They say the Apostle insisteth on a Comparison with the times of the Old Testament, and the False Prophets that were then among the People.

Answ. What of that?

1. Is not the Comparison clear, as those false Prophets were part of the Typical Redeemed People, so are these of the truly Redeemed.

2. That Typical Redemption out of *Egypt* was not only a Type, but also a Fruit of Christs Redemption, in its moral being considered.

1. They say the word ἀγοράζω, signifieth primarily the buying of things, translatitiously the Redemption of Persons.

Answ. 1. It signifies any buying in the Market for a price, whether thing or person. And what other buying with a price can you here devise?

2. It's well known the Holy Ghost useth it to signifie Christ's purchasing of us by his blood, what means it, *Rev.* 5. 9. ἠγόρασας τῷ θεῷ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου? and *Rev.* 14. 3. οἱ ἠγορασμένοι ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. And 1 *Cor.* 6. 20. Ἠγοράσθητε τιμῆς, *Rev.* 14. 4. with many the like.

2. They say [Here is no mention of blood, death, price, or offering of Jesus Christ, as in other places where proper Redemption is treated on.]

Answ. 1. As if ἀγοράζω did not alone signifie to buy with a price.

2. Hath every place that treats of proper Redemption such an addition? View those before cited, and be convinced of the contrary, what's added, *Rev.* 14 3.

The third Reason is, that [the Apostle affirms their deliverance to consist in the escaping of

of the pollution of the World, as Idolatry, false Worship, and the like, by the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, plainly declaring that their buying was only in respect of the enjoyment of the knowledge of the truth, but of the washing in the blood of the Lamb, he is wholly silent.

Answ. The question is of the satisfaction by Sacrifice, whether Christ bought them thereby: This Reason is from the effects and application, if they had not so much as escaped this pollution of the World, it would not follow that Christ did not buye them by his satisfaction, but only that they received not this benefit of it.

2. It is easier beg'd than prov'd, that Christ satisfied for none but those that are washed by his blood.

3. If it had been said that they were washed in the blood of the Lamb, had it not been easie for the same wit to have found another interpretation? and to have said it was spoken but κατὰ δόξαν, because they professed it to be so?

4. He that will well prove that God can and doth so far relax his Law, as to give all these mercies without Christ's satisfying for them to whom they are given, *viz.* washing, escaping the Worlds pollutions by the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour; yea, clean escaping from them who live in errour, *ver.* 18. *&c.)* will do the *Socinians* a greater pleasure, and say more against the necessity of Christ's satisfaction, than ever I saw yet done by any.

And here I would have one strange passage observed in very many Divines, that it may appear

pear how prejudice & *studium partium*, prevails in Mens Studies, and how much the Will can command the Understanding. When we plead that God doth in pardoning Sin for Christ's Sacrifice relax his Law, or dispence with it, and not properly execute it according to its sense, they stifly deny it, and say that it is but an interpreting it κατ' ἐπιείκειαν, according to its reserved exception, and that Christ's suffering was the proper fulfilling of the Law, and the Reason they give is, because they think it of flat necessity that the Law be executed according to its sense, or else it should not be true; or at least, God should not be just; (even *Essenius* himself forsakes *Grotius* in this point,) and yet these same Men will maintain either that God doth without any satisfaction at all so far relax the same Law to wicked men, as to give them all the mercies which they enjoy (*viz.* illumination, a taste of the good word of God, and the powers of the World to come, to be made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and believe for a time, and be sanctified by the blood of the Covenant, and loved of Christ, and clean escape from them that live in errour, and to escape the World's pollutions, and be washed, &c.) or else that God doth this without relaxing his Law, and so, that by the rigorous Law of Works Sinners are not deprived of these Mercies. To the Non-Elect God relaxeth that Law without satisfaction, which to the Elect he doth not, yea cannot relax upon satisfaction. These things are harder to me than to be well digested.

Before

Before I come to their last Reason, I will give you the Judgment of some Orthodox Interpreters on this Text, that you may see whether it be the Mediator Christ, or the Father only, whom they are here said to deny; and whether it be meant of proper Redeeming, or some mercy which they had without Christ's dying for them.

1. And the first shall be *Calvin*, whom I hope in this Controversie none will except against, his words are these, *in loc.* [*Etiam Dominum qui illos redemit. Tametsi variis modis abnegatur Christus, eum tamen hic meo judicio attingit Petrus, qui exprimitur apud Judam; nempe dum Gratia Dei in lasciviam convertitur. Redemit enim nos Christus, ut populum haberet segregatum ab omnibus mundi inquinamentis, addictum sanctitati & innocentiæ. Qui igitur excusso freno in omnem licentiam se projiciunt, non immeritò dicuntur, Christum abnegare a quo Redempti sunt.*] But because *Calvin* judgeth (truly) that these are the same that are spoken of in *Jude* 4. Let us see what he saith of that Text also, lest you think he overshot himself here through inadvertency. His words are these; [*Christum vero abnegari intelligit, Quum hi qui sanguine ipsius Redempti fuerant, diabolo se rursus mancipantes, incomparabile illud pretium, quantum in se irritum faciunt.*

And that you may see δεσπότης is taken for Christ both in *Peter*, and here, and that this is a full Testimony for Christ's Godhead, it being Christ that is here called, [the only Lord God, and our Lord,] see the foregoing words.

[*Deum, qui solus Herus est: Vetusti quidam Codices habent* [*Christum qui solus est Deus ac Herus*] *& certe.* (Others say it is an uncertainty) *in secundâ Petri Epistolâ, solius Christi sit mentio & ille herus vocatur.*] You see *Calvin* speaks both for the sense of these Texts, and the point of Universal Redemption as much and as plain as I.

The second shall be the Divines of the Assembly in their last Edition of their Annotations. Thus they say [*The Lord that bought them, that gave a price sufficient for them, even his own precious blood, Acts* 20. 28. 1 *Cor.* 6. 20. 1 *Pet.* 1. 18, 19.] This is their first exposition, and as a second, they add that from their profession. And they refer us farther to *Jude* 4. where they say thus [Denying the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ; denying Christ to be God, who was their Master by profession (for they professed themselves to be of his Household) and their Lord by publick Authority over them, or by their deeds denying Christ] so that *Despotes* is Christ in their judgment in both places; and this Text speaks for Christ's Godhead.

The Third shall be *Deodate*, who saith [that bought them, *viz.* who by the price of his blood, which they had professed to be partakers of through Baptism, had gotten the Right and Title of Lord and Master over them, to make them his Servants, see *Heb.* 10. 29.]

4. *Beza* also expounds it of Christ as their Redeemer professedly.

5. Dr. *Willet* expoundeth *Jude* 4. (which is confessedly the same with this of *Peter* in sense) thus [and deny God the only Lord and our Lord Jesus Christ. These words thus Translated seem

seem to speak of two Persons, of God the Father, and God the Son: But indeed the whole Sentence is to be understood of Christ, who is called God and δεσπότης Master, and κύριος Lord, So that Lord here in the first place should be translated Master: For Christ is God in respect of his Godhead with his Father. He is our Master, because he hath bought us, 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. He is our Lord, because by him all things are preserved, 1 *Cor.* 8. 6. *Heb.* 1. 3. So that he is God as our Creator, Lord as our Preserver, Master as our Redeemer.

6. Mr. *Dav. Dickson* on 2 *Pet.* 2. 1. expoundeth it of Christ as professed by them to be their Redeemer.

7. *Erasmus*'s Paraphrase is plainly, they shall deny Christ by whose blood they were Redeemed, and whom they professed.

(Many more are here omitted.)

8. Even *Piscator* himself confesseth it spoken of Jesus Christ, and saith thus [*Per quas illi abnegaturi sint Dominum, id est, Christum, qui ipsos mercatus est.*] & [*Periphrasis Christi argumentosa quasi dicat: Christus illos est Mercatus, ergo non debebant eum negare. Mercatus est, viz. pretioso suo sanguine, Confer. Acts* 20 28. 1 *Cor.* 6. 20.] Then comes he in with his last shift, not κατ' ἀλήθειαν *sed* κατὰ δόξαν.

I'll not now stand to transcribe any more, these being of such Authority, and so impartial and the last the most extream in these Controversies of almost any Learned Judicious Pious Divine.

3. I come next to the Third and last Reason, which is given to shew that Christ bought

not these men: The foresaid Author saith Neither is it more certain that the Apostle speaketh of the purchase of the Wolves and Hypocrites, in respect of the reality of the purchase, and not rather in respect of that estimation which others had of them, and by reason of their outward seeming profession ought to have had, and of the profession that themselves made to be purchased by him, &c.] This is the great answer, which is the last refuge: It was κατὰ δόξαν, and not κατ' ἀλήθειαν. I am ashamed unfeignedly to remember the time when I took up with this interpretation my self, and had the face to maintain it.

Consid. 1. It was no act of theirs which the Apostle mentions, (which profession, though dissembled, might have warranted him to ascribe to them, as he may call those Holy, that seem to be Holy by profession:) but it is an Act of Christ (and his passion) long ago performed: He bought them.

2. It is not an act ascribed to them during the time of that profession, while that profession might have better warranted a mistaking charitable judgment; but it is after by Apostacy they cast away that profession, and so if before we might have indulged a charitable mistaken judgment, yet after we may not.

3. It is the words of the Holy Ghost who is the Spirit of truth, and sent to lead the Apostles into all truth: And shall we feign the Spirit of Truth to assert a falsehood, meerly because men profess that falsehood, and this after they reject that profession. Wicked men say Christ bought them, and afterward renounce or deny Christ, therefore

therefore the Spirit of God shall write it to the Churches as Gods word, that Christ did buy them, even they who once falsely said so, but now deny him: O what a bold dealing it is with the Holy Ghost to interpret his words thus, without any need or fair reason!

4. May not a Man by this dealing say what he will as the meaning of Scripture? May not almost any truth of God expressly affirmed in Scripture, be said to be spoken κατα δοξαν, and not κατ' αλήθειαν? God saith as Man would have him, and in giving his Laws to be a rule to the World, he speaks untruly, because men speak so before him, making their speeches the rule of his speech, which is a rule to them.

Blame us not too zealously, if we do not swallow these things so easily; even meerly because Mr. such a one, or such a one saith so.

But let us see why they say so; for sure they have some shew of reason why.

1. They say, [It is the perpetual course of Scripture to ascribe all those things to every one that is in the fellowship of the Church, which are proper to them only who are true spiritual Members of the same, as to be Saints, Elect, Redeemed, &c.

Answ. 1. All professed Christians are Saints by separation from the World to the Church Visible, and Elect or chosen to that Condition.

2. Scripture speaks thus of none but those that seem to be such; the Penmen of Scripture therein speaking of men that knew not the heart.

3. But

3. But when by denying Christ they manifest the contrary, doth the Scripture say yet that they were Elect Saints, &c. or rather that they were before of old ordained to this Condemnation?

4. Why else may not we still use this Language, if it be true that it is the perpetual course of Scripture? Be not then offended with us if we write and say that Christ redeemed by his blood all professed Christians; Nay, then we might say *Julian* was a Saint Elect, and so was *Judas*, &c.

5. I would our Brethren of the separation would speak in the same Language when they are judging of Church-Members, and Communicants, as they do when they use these Arguments against Christs Universal Ransom, or at least come near to this charitable vein, laying by the delusory part.

2. But the great prop of this Cause is, that they will prove from other Texts that the Scripture speaketh thus. And three Texts I find urged, and I may safely say sadly abused.

The first is, *Mat.* 27. 53. *Hierusalem* is called the Holy City, because it was so in esteem and appearance] saith my Author.

Answ. Must we needs take his bare word for this, when we know it was Holy by Gods own separation of it from the rest of the World, for the principal place of his publick Worship, and residence of his Church and Priests, and so denominated by himself? What Man then will believe that it was called Holy, meerly from the Peoples professing to be Holy?

The

The Second Text is *John* 5. 18. It is said of Christ that he had broken the Sabbath, which he only did in the corrupt Opinion of the blinded Pharisees.

Answ. 1. The words seem to speak only of the *Jews* accusation of him, *i. e.* what they charged him to have done, and not what he did, [therefore they sought to lay hands on him, not only because he had broken the Sabbath, *&c.*]

2. Distinguish between breaking the rest of the Sabbath naturally (by Natural actions, contrary to rest but without sin) and breaking it morally by sin. The former way Christ did break the Sabbath, the latter he did not, take this distinction from Christ himself, who tells you, that the Priests in the Temple brake the Sabbath (*viz.* the external rest of it, by labour) and are blameless (and therefore broke it not morally.)

But the Text that I find alledged most frequently and confidently by very many Learned Men, is 2 *Chron.* 28. 23. (and I desire God to forgive me, that in my ignorance I have oft so abused it my self) The words are these [For he Sacrificed to the Gods of *Damascus* that smote him; and he said, because the Gods of the King of *Syria* help them, therefore will I sacrifice to them, that they may help me] The last words are confess'd to be the false words of the deluded Idolater *Ahaz*; but all the question is of the former words, which are the words of the Holy Ghost [He Sacrificed to the Gods of *Damascus* that smote him,] where by supine oversight,

ſight, Men have taken it, as if the Text made this ſmiting the act of the Gods, whereas it makes it the act of *Damaſcus*, or the Men of *Damaſcus*. It was *Damaſcus* that ſmote him, and not the Gods of *Damaſcus*, according to the Text.

Tremelius and *Junius* render it thus plainly, [*Sacrificavit enim Diis Damaſcenorum percutientium ipſum*] not *Diis Damaſcenorum percutientibus ipſum*. And would one think now that ſo great a ſtreſs ſhould be laid by prudent ſober men, on ſuch an overſight. *Darmeſek* being a collective, the Cities name put for the Peoples (than which nothing more uſual when there is mention of the acts of Cities and Countries) did truly ſmite *Ahaz*: As *England* did ſmite *Scotland*: Or *Rome* conquered ſo much of the World: And *Venice* holds War with the *Turk*.

2. What if it had been otherwiſe? May not God give power to thoſe Devils which were the Gods of *Damaſcus*, really to ſmite *Ahaz*? As well as he gave the Devil power to ſmite *Job* a better man.

3. And what if all that they ſuppoſed of this Text had been true? If God had ſpoke in ſo ſtrange a language once in all the Bible? If we ſhall thence take liberty to interpret him ſo elſewhere, without proving this to be the ſenſe, we may then indeed make any thing of the Scripture. And though I doubt not but God in mercy will bear with the weakneſs of good men that by the power of prejudice do run on ſuch expoſitions, having a zeal for God, though not according to knowledge, and ſuppoſing them-

themselves necessitated to it; yet certainly the proper natural tendency of such violent dealing with Scripture is to infidelity it self, and the questioning of the truth of Scripture: and if we escape that, we lie fair open to the invasion of Popery, to conceit a necessity of an Earthly final Judge of the sense of Scripture as being insufficient to manifest its own sense. In the mean time, how do we gratifie Papists and Scepticks by this dealing.

But inded the Text is plain; though I confess the Septuagint; and some Translators might give occasion to some of this common mistake.

The sixth Text that I shall alledge is, *Heb.* 6. 4. 5, 6. *For it is impossible for those who were once inlightened and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God and the powers of the World to come, if they shall fall away to renew them again to Repentance; seeing they crucifie to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to open shame.*

Here these Apostates are said to crucifie the Son of God afresh ἀνασταυροῦντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ It is not barely to crucifie Christ again, but to crucifie him to themselves again: That is, either *finaliter* (as some expound it) or *efficienter* (as others) which way soever it be, it is not *efficaciter*, but *quantum in se.*

1. If it be the first, then the meaning is this: If such be saved, then it must be by a new Sacrifice, and so they bring themselves into that case that Christs Death on the terms that first it was accepted, will not serve to save them, because

(because he died not to satisfie for that sin.) So *Pareus* expoundeth it; *sed quomodo hoc faciendo Christum denuò crucifigunt sibimetipsis? Quia filium Dei semel crucifixum abnegando, nolunt salvari ejus morte ex qua sola dependet resipiscentia & salus. Si igitur resipiscere & servari deberent, denuò crucifigendus esset eis Christus; quod est impossibile, quia amplius mori non potest. Sic infra* cap. 10. *Videtur declarare, non est eis reliqua hostia pro peccato postquam unicam Christi hostiam semel abjecerunt & conculcarunt. Impossible igitur est eos resipiscere & servari.*

So *Calvin* also: *Porro hæc ratio est cur iterum dicat Christum crucifigi, quia nos hâc conditione illi commorimur, ut meditemur perpetuam vitæ novitatem. Quia ergo in mortem recidunt, opus habent secundo sacrificio, ut capite decimo habebimus. Crucifigentes sibi, hoc est, quantum in se est.*

Yea *Beza* himself who seeing what might be said for Universal Redemption from this Text endeavours to put in a bar, yet concludeth thus: *Et fortasse sic potest ista sententia explicari acsi declaretur istos non posse rursum renovari, quoniam rursus oporteret Christum crucifigi & illis ludibriis exponi, quod fieri amplius non potest, illo semel pro mortuis credituris crucifixo, nec in gratiam istorum apostatarum rursum crucifigendo: quam sententiam si amplectamur usi sane probabile & commoda mihi videtur,* &c.] I will add no more (though many more might be added. Now according to this exposition it is evident that it is implied that Christ died for these men: or else there seems no force in the Argument to prove their sin unpardonable, and themselves unrecoverable. For the Holy Ghost here plainly intimateth

mateth that this unrecoverableneſs is the fruit of their Apoſtacy; and that they were not unrecoverable before they were Apoſtates; and yet the reaſon of their uncureableneſs lies in this, that it is neceſſary to their pardon and cure that Chriſt ſhould die again, which cannot be: Now it implieth that he died for them as they were in their ſtate before Apoſtacy, or elſe on this reaſon it might be ſaid as well that their recovery and pardon was as impoſſible then, and ſo their Apoſtacy ſhould not be the reaſon, but Chriſts not dying for them at all ſhould be it: Which is plainly contrary to the Text.

But if any will needs deny this moſt probable interpretation, and expound it *[efficienter*, [that they do as much as they can to kill Chriſt again by their malice and contempt, and making him to be but as a malefactor, do approve of the *Jews* crucifying him] (as *Grotius* and many more expound it) ſtill it intimates that their ſin did put him to Death once before or elſe, what force is there in the Argument? For it ſeems to run thus, [they, that as much as in them lieth, put Chriſt to Death twice (or a ſecond time) are remedileſs: But ſo do theſe Apoſtates, *Ergo*, &c.]

Now if their ſin (as the *pro-cauſa meritoria*) had no hand in his Death at firſt, how can they be therefore remedileſs for endeavouring it a ſecond time? For it was but once by them. And if the ſame ſin was pardonable in thoſe that not only in deſire but in act, did put him to Death, *viz.* the *Jews*; then it appears that it was a pardonable ſin: And that the ſame ſin,

(nay

(nay the *Conatus* or meer desire of it) which was pardonable then, should become unpardonable since, as it is a fancy, and hath no Scripture proof; so it is apparently false, seeing it supposeth that the Law of Christ is not now the same as then, which is false.

A second Argument for Universal satisfaction, this Text affordeth us: Christ satisfied for all those who are inlightened, and have tasted of the Heavenly Gift, and are made partakers of the Holy Ghost, *&c.* But some Non-Elect are such: Therefore Christ satisfied for some Non Elect, and consequently for all.

This Argument is urged before, therefore I shall say little to it. Some answer to the *Minor* that it is to be denied, because this Text doth *nihil ponere sed tantum supponere.*

Answer, But it doth not suppose that which never was nor will be, nor is possible. Most Interpreters (almost all) that are against Universal satisfaction, do expound this Text of those gifts which may and oft are really lost: The number is so many that I will cite none

2. It is further said by some, that these benefits presuppose not Christs dying for them:

Answer, This is answered already. They that can prove that God can, will and doth give all these without satisfaction to his Justice first made, are but a step from *Sociniamism*, and may

may next say, he can and will give pardon without satisfaction: And then they are within a step of infidelity, and next in danger of saying, that Christ Died in vain, surely the Holy Ghost is given by Christ Crucified, and I think only to them for whom he was Crucified. The Devils are not therefore uncurable (for ought any Scripture reveals) because they would put Christ to Death, through malice, if it were in their power; nor had they ever these fruits of his Death. But according to their sense against whom I argue, the Devils might hence be said to be unpardonable, as well as Apostates. Which is no Scripture Doctrine.

The 7th. Text, which I shall urge is, Heb. 10. 26, 27, 28, 29. *For if we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledg of the Truth, there remaineth no more Sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation, which shall devour the Adversaries. He that despised Moses Law, died without mercy, under two or three Witnesses: Of how much sorer punishment suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under Foot the Son of God, and hath counted the Blood of the Covenant wherewith he was Sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done dispight to the Spirit of Grace?* Hence I raise two Arguments.

1. Those who receive the mercies here mentioned are of the number of them for whom Christ died: But such are some Non-elect, *Ergo*, &c. The Blood of the Covenant is shed before it is sprinkled, or Sanctifieth (shed Physically or morally) and it cannot sanctifie Men, be-

fore it is shed for them. For Sanctification, being some degree of application, presupposeth it shed for them: I mean, If by Sanctification, be meant, either separation relative from the World to the Church, and to Christ *secundum quid*: Or else Sanctification real, by giving Men a temporary Faith and other Graces proportionable, and their escaping the pollutions of the World by that Faith. But some think that by Sanctification is meant that cleansing which immediately followed the Sacrifice (the word being used from the *Jewish* Sanctifyings;) and so by Sanctification, should be meant that conditional justification, or cleansing which all Men have immediately from Christ crucified before any further Personal application. And if this be so, then the Case is plain and past question.

The 2d. Argument is from those words [there remaineth no more Sacrifice for sins, but, *&c.*] Here the Apostle proveth the uncurableness and desperateness of their Case, in that there remaineth no more Sacrifice: And this is proper to them when they are Apostates. Now if there were never any Sacrifice for their Sins, then this reason will prove their case no more desperate since their Apostacy than before; nor will it prove the Case of Apostates any more desperate than the Case of all wicked Men for whom Christ died not. But that is contrary to the Text. It is either their own sin or the Elects sin, or some other Mens for whom the Apostle saith, there remaineth no more Sacrifice. If other Mens, then that proves not their

case

case any more desperate than it was: For a Sacrifice for other Mens sins hinders not their Case from being desperate before: Besides, it is no loss to them to lose the Hopes of Life by such a Sacrifice: For they could be no hopes. But it is mentioned here as their loss, and the sad consequent of their Apostacy. If 100 Soldiers be taken Prisoners by the Enemy, and their former Prince shall Redeem 50 of them by a Ransom, and when he hath done shall send to all the 100 to come to him, and be true Soldiers again; and hereupon they all come (though not all alike affected to him) and he tells them all [if ever you sleep on your watch and so be taken by the Enemy again, or if you forsake my Colours and perfidiously turn to the Enemy, there remains no more Ransom for you,] would not any Man wonder both how the 50 not ransomed should come out of Prison at all? Or why the Prince should tell them, There remained no more Ransom for them when they were never ransomed at all? Doubtless the Holy Ghost doth not pronounce these Apostates to be therefore miserable, because there remained no more Sacrifice for other Mens sins: As if you should say to a man in a Consumption, There is now no hope of your Life, because the Physitian hath given one effectual Receipt to your sick Neighbor, and will give him no more.

But if it be acknowledged (as it must be) that the Text means, there is no more Sacrifice for the sins of these Apostates; then it plainly intimates that there was once a Sacrifice for their sin till they by Rejection, deprived themselves of the benefit of it.

Obj. *There was a Sacrifice sufficient for their sin before their Apostacy.*

Ans. 1. And was it not sufficient materially after? Sure according to the opinion of the opponents it was.

2. If it were only sufficient to have been a Sacrifice for them, but was not a Sacrifice for them at all, (which is their Sense;) then their condition was as remediless before their Apostacy as after; and then this could be no part of their misery procured by Apostacy.

3. The Apostle saith not [there remained no more sufficiency for them in the Sacrifice] but [there remaineth no more Sacrifice.]

Obj. *They did now fully discover that Christ died not for them, which was never discovered before; and therefore they are more miserable.*]

Ans. Then all the inconvenience that Apostacy brought on them was but a disclosing of the truth (that they had never any remedy or Sacrifice for their sin) a little sooner than it should else have been disclosed. But that's a far smaller matter than the Apostle intendeth. And then it should rather be said [there is no more ground left for false hopes and mistakes: All this while you falsly thought Christ died for you, but now because you have denied him, it is disclosed to you that he never died for you.] Indeed this Doctrine suits well with the *Antinomian* fancies, which make our love and obedience

dience to Christ to have no more tendency to Salvation than as meer signs and duties.

2. The Text plainly intimates the contrary to what this objection affirmeth: For it saith not [there is no more false conceits of a Sacrifice for sin] but [there is no more Sacrifice for sins.]

Obj. *It was before offered them by the Word and general conditional promise: But after their Apostacy it is offered them no more; and therefore it is said, there is no more Sacrifice.*

Ans. 1. It cannot be offered to them, with a possibility of their acceptance or benefit, till it be first offered for them to the Father: That which is offered is [a Christ that hath redeemed us; with his benefits] A Christ that hath not redeemed or ransomed us, is a gift that would not save us, if he were offered by God and accepted by us.

2. Indeed Christs Sacrifice for sin was offered only to the Father, and is not at all offered to us. Christ himself is offered to us, but not as a Sacrifice, but as a Ransomer, or one that was a Sacrifice offered to God for us, and now would be a Head and Husband to us. His benefits also by this Sacrifice merited are offered to us, but not the Sacrifice it self.

Calvin on the Text saith thus [*Hostiam ergo ius residuam esse negat qui a Christi morte discedunt; quod non sit particulari aliquo delicto, sed abjecta in totum fide, &c. Nam quum mors Christi unicum sit Remedium quo ab æterna morte liberamur, qui vim*

illius atque beneficium quantum in se est abolent, non[e] *digni sunt quibus preter desperationem nihil reliquum fiat? Qui in Christo manent, eos ad quotidianam reconciliationem Deus invitat: Quotidie irrigantur Christi sanguine: Quotidie expiantur eorum peccata perpetuo ejus Sacrificio, si extra eum non est quaerenda salus, ne miremur omnes qui eum sponte relinquent, omni spe venia privari, &c. Eos igitur solos notat Apostolus qui Christum impiè deserendo mortis ejus beneficio se privant.*

Pareus makes it to be the *Apostacy* it self that had no Sacrifice, [*si ab agnita veritate Evangelii ad judaicas hostias malitiosè relabantur, nulla eis reliqua sit hostia pro ἀποστασίᾳ peccato expiando.*] And comparing this Text with *Heb* 6 6. And shewing that they speak of the same thing, he shews that this is the punishment of *Apostates*, that [there is no more Sacrifice for sin.] But certainly if there were never any Sacrifice for their sin at all, that could not be as a punishment for their Apostacy: Christ did not punish Mens Apostacy on the Cross by not dying for them, *Pareus* adds [*Hostiam pro peccato intelligit expiatoriam propter quam Deus placatus remittat eis peccata. Negando hanc reliquam esse Apostatis, negat spem remissionis, veniæ, gratiæ aut salutis ullam eis superesse. Negando enim causam negat effectum: Quæris cur nulla superfit? Quia non est nisi unica Hostia peccatorum expiatrix, nempe Pontificis Christi hactenus ad longum demonstrata: Hanc vero abjecerunt Apostata. Nulla igitur alia eis est reliqua.*) So that there was a Sacrifice remaining to them for their sin, before their Apostacy.

Bullinger

Bullinger in loc. saith [*Jam vero cum non sit alia nisi una pro peccatis hostia, illi autem hanc unicam contemnant; certè aliam non invenient ullam.*] *Marlorat* adds [*talibus ergo contemptoribus nulla spes veniæ relinquitur*] So that they had a Sacrifice for sin till they Apostatised. So *Dickson* also in *loc. Piscator*, and many more (for I will name none but who are known to be against universal Redemption, lest their exposition be rejected.) To all this I find no more objections of our opponents; but to the first argument which we draw hence they return many words. Which was, both from all those benefits which here Apostates are said to partake of, which only Christs Blood hath procured them, and specially in that they are expresly ascribed to Christs Blood: for they are said to have been sanctified by the Blood of the Covenant:) Now to this they say (to give you the Sense briefly: For if I should recite and answer the maze of words which some here use, I should provoke the Reader to throw away all in weariness or loathing.

1. This speaks only of some that were professors of the Faith of the Gospel, separated from the World, brought into the Church, &c. but these are not all Men.

Answ. Grant that it is some Non-Elect, and it is as much as I desire from this Text. And if that be granted, I think there is few would question but that it is for all the Non-Elect in the Church that Christ died. And for those that never heard of him (though I am past doubt that Christ satisfied for the sins

of all Mankind, yet) the use of the point is so small, that I will not contend much about it with any.

2. They say [the Apostle doth neither declare what hath been, nor affert what may be, but only adds a commination upon a suppofition of a thing, &c.]

Anſ. This I answered before. I'll stand to the Judgment of almost any learned Expositor on this Text, though against Universal Redemption. See *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Paraus*, *Piſcator*, *Perkins*, *Dickſon*, *Bullinger*, &c.

3. They say [It is certain that these Men made profeſſion of all these things, &c. and therefore the open renouncing them was a sin so hainous as deserved all this Commination, though the Apostates themselves had never interest in Christs Blood.]

Anſw. What's this to the point? The Text saith, they were sanctified by the Blood of the Covenant, and not only they profeſſed that they were.

4. They say [it was the manner of the Saints and Apoſtles themselves to esteem of all baptised initiated persons, ingrafted into the Church as sanctified persons: So that speaking of Backsliders, he could not make mention of them any otherwise, than as they were commonly esteemed to be, and at that time in the Judgment of charity were to be considered, &c.]

Answ. 1. How much doth it differ from the language of Men when they are pleading for Separation? Then they cannot endure to hear that all the baptised are called Saints by the Apostles and Churches.

2. Indeed only those are so called that seem probably to be so.

3. And therefore what is this to them that by Apostacy into a remediless misery, shew themselves not to be so. The Apostles will not encourage known falshood in the Speeches or Opinions of others, much less be the Authors of it, and lead them into it; doth the Apostle here pronounce their Case hopeless and remediless, and tell them there is no Sacrifice for their sin but a fearful looking for of Judgment, *&c.*? and doth he at the same time perswade People to believe, that they were sanctified by the Blood of the Covenant, *&c.* if it were not true? Even then when it openly discovereth it self false or is supposed so to do?

5. They say] if the Text be interpreted positively and according to the truth of the thing it self in both parts thereof, *viz.*

1. That these of whom the Apostle speaketh were truly sanctified.

2. That such may totally perish, then these two things will follow;

1. That faith and Sanctification is not the Fruit of Election.

2. That Believers may fall finally from Christ.

Answ. 1. These were truly sanctified, though not with that Sanctification which is proper to the Elect and saved.

2. No

2. No doubt such may and do fall away and perish. He that denieth this must deny to believe Christ, who hath expressly affirmed it in *Mat.* 13. That they in whom the Word is not deeply rooted do believe for a while, and in the time of temptation or persecution fall away. What else is our distinction between Temporary Faith and saving?

3. When common Faith and Sanctification is antecedent to special Faith and Sanctification, and so found in the Elect, it is then a Fruit of Election: But when it is found in others, it is no Fruit of Election. And why should they wonder at that, who deny it to be a Fruit of Satisfaction or Ransom, which is a more Universal cause then Election is?

6. They further say [there is nothing in the Text to perswade that the Persons here spoken of, must needs be truly justified and regenerated Believers, much less that Christ died for them, &c.]

Answ. 1. That they were illuminated, and partakers of the Holy Ghost, and sanctified by Christs Blood the Text speaks without strained consequence: (with *Heb.* 6.6. But that they had true special saving Faith, Regeneration or Sanctification, I affirm not. Yet was it true.

2. Is it a strained consequence to conclude,

1. That he who by Apostacy is fallen into that misery which he was never in before, and other sinners are not in, that now there is no more Sacrifice for his sin, had before a Sacrifice? And so have other sinners that be not fallen so far as he is?

2. Or

2. Or that he who is sanctified by the Blood of the Covenant, was one whose sins caused that Blood? and for whom it was shed? If you had proved that it sanctifieth those for whom it was never shed, then you had done something; so much for this Text. I had thought to have answered all the objections of the contrary-minded which the Books at hand afford; but I shall do far less than I thought to do in it, as finding that they are so disordered, wordy and weak, in many, that I shall but fill Paper with needless Lines, and be tedious and ungrateful to the judicious Readers.

The 8th. Text which I will insist on is *Matth.* 22. 2, 3, 4, 12, 13. *The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a certain King, which made a Marriage for his Son, and sent forth his Servants to call them that were bidden to the wedding, and they would not come: And he sent forth other Servants, saying, Tell them that were bidden, saying, Behold, I have prepared my Dinner, My Oxen and my Fatlings are killed, and all things are ready: Come unto the Marriage, &c. Then said he to his Servants, the Wedding is ready, but they which were bidden were not worthy,* So 12. 13.

Here it is agreed on that God is the King: The Wedding feast, is Christ and the benefits of his Death offered by the Gospel. The killing of the Fatling most say, doth intimate the killing of Christ that he may be to us the Bread of Life, and his Flesh Meat indeed, and his Blood Drink indeed. The Messengers are Preachers: The message is the Gospel Invitation or Offer. Hence therefore I thus argue:

If

If all the things are ready before hand which upon coming in to Christ are to be received, yea and ready for those that refused to come, and only their not coming, or not coming preparedly do hinder their participation, then Christ was a Sacrifice made ready even for all that refused to come. But, *&c. Ergo, &c.*

I mean not that Christ was appointed to save final refusers considered as such: But he was a Sacrifice for all the Sins of the same Men, except their final refusal, and thereby made ready for them all those saving benefits, which upon coming in they were to receive. This message any Minister of the Gospel may now deliver to unbelievers: Come in to Christ; accept him as a Redeemer, Lord and Saviour, and with him pardon and Salvation; for all this is ready: All that is prerequisite to believing or coming in, is done by Christ, as far as concerned him as a Sacrifice and a Donor of his Testamentory benefits; and as far as unsatisfied Justice did require: All things that are requisite objectively to your believing are ready. Now this could not be a truth; if Christ had not been a Sacrifice for these Mens Sins: For how is all ready when the very first and most needful thing is unready, that is, an expiatory Sacrifice for sin? When satisfaction to justice is unready? Can they make this? Or are they called to make it? Or would their coming in make it, which was not before made? Or would coming in serve turn without satisfaction? Rather it should be said to them (as to the Devils) come not, for nothing is ready. For where Christ is not ready, and satisfaction for sin not ready, there

nothing

nothing is ready which a sinner is called to by the Gospel. The Cause being wanting, all the Effects must needs be wanting.

Obj. *All may be said to be ready, in that Christs Death is sufficient for All.*

Ans. That's true; and I desire no more; if you understand it as Divines have hitherto done, and as this Text proves it; that is, that it is a sufficient Ransom, Sacrifice, Price, Satisfaction for all. But then this implieth that it is a Ransom, Sacrifice, *&c.* for All. But according to the new futile evasion, it is false, *viz.* that Christs Death was only sufficient to have been a Sacrifice or Ransom for All, if God or Christ had so been willing: but indeed was no Ransom for them at all. For is this making all ready? Is Christ any readier for those he died not for, than for the Devils? or than if he had never died at all? Will you send to a Prisoner and say, I have paid 1000 *l.* for thy fellow Prisoner that owed but 500 *l.* the sum is sufficient to have discharged thy debt too, if I had ever intended it, therefore come and receive a discharge, for all is ready? Or will you bid your Servant go to all the Town and say, I have killed and dressed meat enough for you all, resolving that some of you shall never taste of it on any conditions, therefore come now and partake of it all, for all things are ready? The Readiness that Christ speaks of here is such, as supposeth all things to be ready except receiving by Faith: nothing but coming is wanting.

Obj.

Obj. *But Faith it self is not ready, therefore Christ died not for them.*

Anſ. A falſe conſequence which yet bears the whole fabrick of the oppoſers Cauſe.

1. Doth not the Text plainly diſtinguiſh here between Faith and all the Benefits that by Faith we are partakers of? Doth it not plainly ſay, that all things (elſe) are ready; when yet Faith in them was unready, for they would not? But the Invitation was come, for all things are ready: what a ſilly cavil would men put into the mouths of the invited, teaching them to ſay, my coming is not ready; therefore all things are not ready: nay nothing is made ready for me. This Text expreſly diſtinguiſheth between all other things, and coming: and ſo ſhews, that when men will not come, yet all things were ready, and nothing but Faith was wanting to their participation. And therefore Chriſt may be a Sacrifice made ready for thoſe, that have not Faith, and therefore receive him not.

2. And you might ſee ſome of the reaſon of this in the Text: The King in one Relation prepares the feaſt: and in a further invites his Gueſts: and in a further compels them to come in; God and the Redeemer as preparer of the feaſt, (which is 1. By ſatisfying Juſtice. 2. By enacting the New Law) have made all things ready. But to give Faith belongeth not to him in either of theſe reſpects.

2. God and Chriſt as the Inviter of his Gueſts, doth all things requiſite to the invited.

3. But

3. But God as one that resolveth *de Eventu*, what particular persons shall be compelled to come in, gives that Faith, or so compels them. Faith follows this compelling (which, say Interpreters truly and generally, is an importunate prevailing persuasion) Now may not God

1. Make Christ a Sacrifice for all, ready?

2. And by Legislation or conditional Donation, make a free gift of Christ to all that will have him?

3. And invite multitudes that will refuse; and yet compel but his chosen only to come in? Here it is that special differencing Grace begins, in the execution; and it confoundeth men in the whole body of Theology when they will needs suppose it to begin where it doth not, that is, in Redemption by Sacrifice. All men shall one day confess, all things were ready: if I would have come in I had been saved: it was my own wilful refusal that deprived me.

Obj. *But why doth not God compel all to come in as well as some?*

Ans. 1. O man! who art thou that disputest with God? May he not do with his own as he will? He compelleth some from the superabundance of his Mercy: He inviteth the rest in great mercy also.

2. This will be no excuse to the refusers: what if God had only invited all, and compelled none? What if he had suffered all to perish in their wilfulness? would this have been any ease to any? and if he compel some, is that any wrong to the rest? will not Conscience say another

ther day, I perish justly, that would not be saved? must I need compulsion to accept of a Redeemer and Salvation with him?

Obj. *But it is not in my Power to come: I cannot.*

Ans. There's no man that would come that can say so: if you will you can, yea you do come. If you will not, who will you blame but your self, you may come if you will. As your will-not may be called *a cannot*, so it's true, you *cannot*: your *cannot* and *will-not* is all one. As for those men that open their mouths against the most High, and say, that [if God give not willingness and faith to men, he doth but delude them to tell them that Christ died for them, and to give them Christ, if they will.] I intreat them to consider,

1. God hath laid the cause of mens perdition on their own will, still in his word, and will do at Judgment.

2. God hath taught all men naturally to accuse themselves when their wilfulness was the cause.

3. The light of Nature teacheth all Nations under Heaven to lay the blame on the wilful, and to make all their Laws, and execute all their Judgments on that ground, acquitting men so far as they can be discovered to have been forced and involuntary, excusing him that can say [I did it against my Will] condemning those that did it willingly. Deny this therefore and you deny, 1. The Law of God in Scripture. 2. The Law of natural Conscience. 3. And

overthrow

overthrow all Laws of Nature and Nations, and all Churches and Commonwealths. Did ever any sober Prince say, I will not condemn a man for wilful Murther, because he hath not free-will, nor power to forbear it, except God give it him? Or did ever wise Judge absolve an offender on that ground? If a Whore-monger or Drunkard so accustom themselves to those sins that they have contracted a habit, and cannot forbear them, did ever any Law-giver, Judge or Wise man, take that for an excuse? Or rather for the most hainous aggravation of his fault? God and Nature hath taught all men, in their enquiries after the cause of sin, to stop at mans Will and lay the blame there. I intreat wise godly men therefore, that they would not shut the very eyes of Nature it self, and overthrow all order of things for their by-conceits; and when they have done to fly in Gods Face with such horrid desperate unreverence and presumption, as to say, God deceives and deludes men, if he give a Ransom for them, and give them Christ and Pardon on condition of their willingness, except he also make them willing. I have before shewed it (without any participation with *Pelagius*) that all men that perish do suffer for abuse of Grace, sufficient to its immediate use and end: and if God will not suffer all so to perish, but compel some to come in, when he doth but invite others; our Eye must not be evil because he is good. He deals mercifully with all, but more mercifully with some: those therefore shall for ever glorifie his Mercy, and the rest be

left without all just excuse, and be speechless.

The 9th Text is *Mat.* 18. 27, 32, 34, 35. *Then the Lord of that Servant was moved with compassion and loosed him and forgave him the Debt.* &c. *Then his Lord after that he had called him said unto him: O thou wicked Servant, I forgive thee all that debt because thou desiredst me: shouldst not thou also have had compassion on thy fellow Servant, even as I had pity on thee? And his Lord was wroth and delivered him to the Tormentors till he should pay all that was due unto him. So likewise shall my Heavenly Father do also to you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his Brother their trespasses.* Here it's plainly said by Christ himself, that the debt was forgiven him, who afterward perished. Whence I argue *ab effectu ad causam*, therefore Christ died for him. For without Blood there is no remission.

Two things are said against this. 1. That *Theologia parabolica non est Argumentativa.*

Ans. And I am sure that Christ's Theology is not delusory or false. If he taught by Parables, then his Parables were and are teaching; and if teaching, then we may argue from them. But consider, though it's certain that nothing in Parables is to be stretched beyond the intent, yet this is the plain sense and intent; Christ shewing that those that have received mercy for their own sins, must forgive others, or else they shall perish as ungrateful for what they had received, and as unmerciful to others.

1. It is twice over expressly said that, [he forgave him the Debt.]

2. The

2. The effect followed, he looſed him, *viz.* from Priſon.

3. It is the aggravation of his following ſin, to be ungrateful for his own pardon; and there is no ingratitude poſſible, if it had not been true that he received that mercy himſelf.

4. Chriſt expreſly openeth and applieth all this to his own Diſciples, ſaying, ſo alſo will my Heavenly Father do to you, if you from your Hearts forgive not, *&c.* ſo that it is paſt doubt that this forgiveneſs was real.

2. The other objection is this: Thoſe that are forgiven never fall away or periſh: and therefore this parable is not ſo to be underſtood.

Anſ. The text ſaith plainly, the debt was forgiven: and therefore it is certainly true. There is a fourfold forgiveneſs of ſin; which I deſire may be well obſerved. Firſt, upon Chriſts undertaking to ſuffer, and ſo his moral ſatisfying, God the Father as the offended Legiſlator of the Law of Nature, remitted his right of puniſhing and advantage of honouring his Juſtice, meerly on that ground, and in that Relation; ſuſpending the obligation of that Law, and delivering up the ſinner and all his Debts into the full power or hands of him that Redeemed him, giving him authority to give remiſſion to whom he pleaſed on terms of Grace: ſo that as Chriſt and not man did ſatisfie Juſtice; ſo it ſeemed moſt meet to the Wiſdom of God, that Chriſt and not man himſelf ſhould be the firſt receiver of the pardon and other benefits: but with this difference.

1. Christ receiveth them *eminenter in potestate conferendi*, as *he hath power to confer them on the Redeemed*: But we receive them from Christ *formaliter*, in themselves.

2. Christ receiveth them for our good; It is not the pardon of any sins of his own that he receiveth. But we receive them for our own good. So that *God hath given us eternal life, and this life is in his Son: and he that hath the Son hath life*: God hath put a Pardon for us into Christs hands, in giving him this Power: and Christ must be the conveyer to us, in the exercise of his Power, For as the *Father Judgeth no man*, but *hath committed all Judgment to the Son*; so he Absolveth no man, but hath committed all Absolution to the Son: For Absolution is one half of Judgment. That is, God as the Rector according to the meer Law of Nature, and as meer Creator, on the first ground judgeth no man: But now he judgeth all as Redeemer on terms of Mercy, by him that Redeemed us; and so Absolveth.

So then the first pardon of sin, was in *Potentia Remittendi*, virtual, put into the hand of Christ only, for his Sacrifice and Satisfaction; and not to the sinner immediately himself.

2. The second Pardon, is by Christ thus Authorized: and it is by him as Donor, Testator or Legislator of the new Law: and it is, [A] Grant of Remission of sins to All men, on condition, they will accept him and pardon [with him] so that this is Christs first pardoning act and this is but a conditional pardon, and therefore is not yet full, and actual.

3. Th

3. The third Pardon of sin, Is Christs actual Pardon upon the performance of the condition: which is not by any new physical act, but by a new moral act of the former Law or Grant; which till now was suspended, upon the non-performance of the condition: it being the Will of the Legislator or Donor, that his Instrument should not act or remit sin till men believe.

4 The fourth Pardon and most full, is that by the absolving Sentence at Judgment, by Christ as Judge when our sins shall be blotted out, when that time of refreshing comes, as the Apostle speaks *Act.* 3. These four are several acts tending to the full perfecting of our Pardon and Justification, and are all called Pardon, and must all proceed in this order one after another.

Moreover the third of these, or the propereſt remission in this life, is of divers sorts or degrees, according to the *Termini à quibus*. the divers sins or penalties Remitted: As is the second also. From thence therefore we must next distinguish of Remission, as we did before from the nature of the remitting act: For the word [Remission] of sin, signifieth the Dissolution of the Obligation to Punishment; and so doth constitutive Justification too: But the term Justification respecteth more strongly [the obligation] dissolved; and the word [Remission] more strongly respecteth [the Punishment] to which we were obliged; not that Remission doth only respect the Punishment (as some mistake) and not the obligation at all; but it chiefly respecteth the Punishment. And there-

fore it is both *Obligationis Relaxatio vel Remissio, & Pœnæ Remissio*, but most properly and principally the last. And therefore it is a right distribution of Remission, which is taken from the diversity of the Penalties remitted.

Let us therefore First distinguish of Punishment that we may the better distinguish of Remission. And before that let us define Punishment.

Punishment *Actually* taken, *Punitio*, is. The Action of a Governour depriving an Inferiour of some natural good, because of some fault by him committed (or because of some Moral Evil.)

Punishment *Passively* taken, *Pœna* is a privation of some natural good, Inflicted for the desert of some Moral Evil.

The Matter of Punishment is Natural Evil: and therefore the first thing intended by the Inflicter is, *ut noceat patienti*; that it may hurt the Sufferer, and so may have the Matter of Punishment. The form, is its Relation to a fault, *viz.* that it be [because of some Moral Evil:] The end is [the demonstration of Justice] this end enters the definition of Punishment in General, and is common to all Punishment. The other ends proper to each *Species*, are to be fetcht from the definition of that *Species*.

And first *quoad Materiam* Punishment is of two sorts.

1. Some Punishment is destructive to the sinner: and some is lesser, consisting in the removal of such good, whose loss is tolerable.

2. *Quoad*

2. *Quoad finem*, some punishment is for the Demonstration of Justice most eminently and principally; and that is either

1. When there is all Justice in utmost Rigour, and no remitting mercy.

2. Or when the remitting mercy is small comparatively, and Justice is most eminently demonstrated.

2. Some Punishment is for the demonstration of Justice conjunct with a far greater and more eminent demonstration of Mercy. This is commonly called [Chastisement] yea, [Paternal Chastisement] because of tenderness and Love that accompanieth it; though indeed it is common to a Master, a Prince, or any Rector to Chastise, as well as a Father. God punisheth in this sort.

I. Rebels, or Unbelievers.

1. To Restrain them.

2. To Reclaim them.

1. From Total Rebellion.

2. From a seeming Religiousness, or half Christianity, to Sincerity.

3. From particular Sins.

II. True Believers, his Adopted Sons.

1. To weaken their Corrupt Inclinations, and strengthen their Holy Inclinations.

2. To raise them from particular falls, and excite particular Graces into lively exercise.

3. Remotely.

1. To fit them for great Works.

2. To fit them for greater Glory hereafter.

3. To Glorifie his Power and Grace in their sustentation, and deliverance.

4. But still the end of Punishment as such,

or of the Evil that is in it, is the demonstration of Justice in some measure, however moderated and prevailed over by Mercy; even Fathers Chastise their Children in Paternal Justice, but with a prevailing Love; and Vindictive it is, though not in that rigorous Sense, as the first mentioned sort of punishment is Vindictive.

And as Remission must be distinguished according to the diversity of the penalty remitted, so also in respect of the sins remitted. (Though to remit Sin, and to remit punishment is all one) for it is,

1. Either the whole general Mass of Sin past, and present, habitual, and actual, (besides Original imputed Sin) which is remitted at once, (which is at our first Repenting and Believing sincerely.) This is called Universal Remission, or Justification: Or else

2. It is particular sins of Act, Omission, or Habit, that are remitted to one who had all the sins of his Unregenerate State pardoned before, and was disposed to this Actual, as being Habitually Penitent, and Believing. This is commonly called Particular Remission, or Justification.

Also in regard of the obligation, dissolved remission must be distinguished. For it is either the penalty of the Law of Works (which is remitted to all Believers.)

2. Or the Penalty of the Law of Christ (which it obligeth men to for non-performance of the Conditions of the Law,) which is remitted to no man; some who say the Law of works is totally abrogated, do call this last [the peremptory

remptory sentence of Christ's Law] as distinct from the former, which they call [the remissible sentence of Christ's Law,] but all comes to one in sense.

Moreover, Remission must be distinguished *quoad jus ipsum*, or its very form Into,

1. Inceptive, or Remission given at first.

2. And Continuate, or Remission confirmed and continued; (which requireth a continued moral action of the remitting Law or Grant, and more than the continuance of our Faith, which was the Condition of inceptive Remission, *viz.* The addition of sincere obedience, and the continuance thereof.

By all this it may appear that remission of sin is variously distinguishable, and not to be taken in one and the same sense wherever we find the word in Scripture.

And because I have run so far in distinguishing, I will add some Conclusions in application of them.

Conclus. 1. In the first remitting act (wherein God so far remitteth sin as to let go his *Jus Puniendi*, as *Rector secundum legem operum* meerly, and giveth up all into the hands of the Redeemer, to give out remission as he please on terms of Grace) in this act, I say God doth remit all the sins of all mankind, as they are against the Law of works. Of this are meant those Scriptures which say [Christ having purged away our sins, ascended, &c.] *Heb.* 1. 3. And that he took away the sins of the World, and that God was in Christ reconciling the World to himself, not imputing to them their iniquities, &c. 2 *Cor.* 5. 19, 20.

Conclu.

Concl. 2. In the second remitting act (by which Christ first gives out pardon according to the power given him) Christ the Redeemer and the Father by him, doth forgive conditionally all sins to all men, except what the very nature of the Condition excepteth, *viz.* The Non-performance of the said Condition.

Concl. 3. Neither of these Acts, or any following, do remit the proper, *viz.* final non-performance of the Conditions of remission.

Concl. 4. In the third act, Christ doth actually remit to every true Believer all the destructive Penalty of all his sins past or present, and all that Penalty whatsoever which proceedeth from the intention of demonstrating Justice above Mercy, or prevailing or rigorous Justice, commonly called vindictive in a more rigid restrained sense.

Concl. 5. It is not only the Eternal punishment, but all the temporal punishment which is of the fore-described Nature, which Christ remitteth to every Believer.

Concl. 6. At the same time he disposeth him to the daily receiving of a daily pardon for daily sins, both in that his former sins being all pardoned his person is Accepted and Adopted, and his Soul habituated to that Faith and Repentance which is the Condition, and possessed of the Spirit, which maintaineth these Graces.

Concl. 7. Yet are not his sins actually pardoned before they are committed.

Concl. 8. Inceptive Remission is actual, and equal to absolute (as to the present possession of it) as soon as men believe; but as to the continuance of it, both Universal and particular Remission

mission, are still but Conditional till death, and the Condition of Continuance (as is beforesaid) is more than the Condition of our first obtaining.

Concl. 9. That Men lose not Justification or Remission, therefore comes not from the Nature of the thing, nor the Tenor of the Remitting-Grant, which being Conditional, supposeth ever the possibility of the Non-performance of the Condition: (alas, more than possibility,) but it comes from the good pleasure of God to maintain that Grace in his Elect which he hath given them, so far as to see infallibly that they perform the Condition of continued and renewed Remission and Justification, by causing them to persevere, and overcome, and therefore God as Legislator (in Precepts, Prohibitions, Threats, and Rewarding Promises) doth still deal with all Men as defectible, and supposeth the possibility of their falling away from Grace, and perishing. But God as Eternal Elector, and Determiner of Events by his Decrees, dealeth with all his Elect as Men whom he resolveth infallibly to Save, and whose Apostacy is, though possible, yet *non futura*, a thing that never shall be; yea, in respect to the power of any Enemy to deceive them by overcoming God's preserving grace; so the deceiving or perverting of them is properly impossible, as well as not future (as Christ himself tells us.)

Concl. 10. It is evident therefore that Remission and Justification are not perfect in this life, both in that many sins are still behind to be remitted, and from whose guilt a particular Justification is necessary to be added, and also because

cause the very continuance of the Justification and Remission received is but Conditional; and a Conditional Grant is not so perfect as an absolute, or when the Condition is all performed.

Concl. 11. That punishment which man was sentenced to *Gen.* 3. after his fall, and the Redeemer inflicteth in this Life on merciful terms (where there is a greater demonstration of mercy, than vindictive Justice, which is commonly called corrective punishment or chastisement,) is never wholly remitted to any, even of the Elect themselves in this Life. All Men must eat their bread in sorrow, and be sick and dye, and the Earth is still cursed with barrenness for our sakes, and the remnants of God's frowns, and want of Communion with him, and want of more Grace and Spirit from him, and of mortification of our Sins, are all sad punishments which the Elect must here undergo. As for those that say that none of these are punishments, I have elsewhere confuted them at large.

1. They contradict express Scripture.
2. And Orthodox Divines.
3. They understand not the definition of Punishment, else would they know that Chastisement is a *Species* of it. Nor is it true that they say, that God hath taken away all the evil of Affliction, but only he hath taken away the Destructive Evil, and introduced or added a greater prevailing good, which yet this Evil must (and that but by accident) produce. It is essentially *quoad materiam, malum naturale* still; *& quoad formam* it is *propter malum morale*. So that *quoad Receptionem peccatoris pœnitentis*, as to our Reception, Remission of Sin is not *omnibus numeris*

mentis perfect in this Life, there being still some unforgiven Punishment to be suffered here.

Hence you may see how to judge of the Controversie so much agitated between us and the Papists, *Utrum Remissâ Culpa remaneat pœna temporalis*? Whether Temporal Punishment remain when the Sin is forgiven: (And how indistinctly that question is commonly handled; *etiam per magni nominis Theologos* (*Detur Venia censuræ necessariæ.*)

As merciful corrective Punishment is not all remitted in this Life, to any of the Elect, so Sin it self is to them so far unremitted, as the punishment is unremitted. I weigh not the Clamours that some will make against this Assertion, who use more zealously to assert the Dictates of their Leaders, than the words of God; and to search and learn what the Orthodox say, than what God saith, or the Nature of the thing containeth. Hear the Scripture, *Lam.* 3. 42. [*We have transgressed, we have Rebelled, thou hast not pardoned.*] This was spoken by the Prophet in his own name, and the name of all God's People, the *Jews*, because of their Temporal Sufferings.

Abundance of the like importance might be cited from Scripture, but this is not the place. Methinks those *Antinomians* should not be against this Doctrine, who (falsly) teach, that that it is only Temporal Punishment or Chastisement that Believers Pray against, when they daily Pray, *forgive us our Trespasses* (as the most moderate of their Books do affirm.

Con.

Concl. 12. This imperfection in Remission of Sin here, comes not from any deficiency in Gods Love, or Christs satisfaction, but from God's Wisdom (in the right giving out of his Mercies) and Man's State, and the nature of the work. Yea, *in sensu activo*, in respect of God as meer Legislator of the Law of Works, Remission may be said to be perfect; that is, *quantum in se in illa Relatione*, he hath perfectly pardoned it, by quitting all his right of punishing, into the hands of the satisfier. From whom he *receives*, to him he *delivereth*. But Christ seeth it meet to give it out to us on Conditions, and by Degrees; and we are not at the highest Degree 'till the end of all, at Judgment; (even the Remission it self, and not only the manifestation is thus given by Degrees.) And so it may be longer coming to us, and be still passively imperfect through our incapacity. As a King receiving a Ransom for a Prisoner, may agree when all the Ransom is paid, that yet he shall be delivered but by Degrees, or upon Conditions.

Caveat. 13. Yet some and many Degrees of the foresaid Corrective Temporal Punishment are remissible, and Christ hath Conditionally promised to remit them in this Life.

He having now the inflicting of all Punishment committed to him (*John* 5. 22.) hath threatned more in his new Law to some (yet disobedient) than to others; and promised more forbearance and tender dealing to some than to others.

Concl. 14. But this is not by so Universal and unreserved a promise, as the Remission of Destruct-

Destructive punishment, and as Salvation is given by: But it is by a Promise with Exception or Reserve: As if Christ should say, [Ordinarily you may expect to smart most, when you sin most, and to be remitted and eased most, (*Consideratis Considerandis*, taking one thing with another) when you please me best: But yet I reserve my *Jus Dominii*, yea, and power of punishing even the best, as shall seem meet to my wisdom, for publick good, or prevention of Sin not yet committed, or manifesting my Wisdom, or Power, or Goodness, *&c.*] So that mark here,

1. That still this is punishment, and for Sin, (if we had nothing but Original Sin) when it is absolutely considered, why God punisheth the best; it is for sin. But when it is asked comparatively, why he punisheth *Job* more than another, it is not for Sin, and therefore in the Comparative Sense, that is, oft rather to be called Affliction, Persecution, (as from Men) Tribulation, *&c.* which in the Absolute sense, must still be called Chastisement, or Punishment.

2. Mark that this Gospel Promise of Mercy, and remission of Temporal Corrective Punishment in part, is properly a Conditional Promise as it respecteth God's ordinary dealing with Men, but it is not an infallible ascertaining Promise as to this or that particular Person, though they do perform the Condition: because (as is said) it hath, besides the Condition on our part, certain Exceptions and Reserves on Christ's part; (from hence you may see how to answer the Question, whether we must pray for temporal

ral Deliverances, Absolutely, or Conditionally.

Concl. 15. As all Punishments on the Elect before Conversion (while yet God hateth them as Workers of Iniquity, and they are Children of wrath) are not of the first sort (in demonstration of prevailing Rigorous Justice) but most commonly Merciful Chastisements, (for they are oft the happy occasions of their Conversion, yea, powerful means thereto:) So the like must be said of the Non-Elect themselves, who are but in the same state, even they are the subjects of tender Chastisement, and in a gracious sense God is oft called their Father in Scripture, tho' not in that special strictest sense as he is the Father of the Adopted, as not giving them that special Grace, but common only. The Reason is, because though God have unequal Intentions *de eventu*, in Chastising the Elect, and the Non-Elect, yet

1. He doth demonstrate more Mercy than Rigorous Vindictive Justice even in the punishments of the Non-Elect, and therefore their Punishments are such Chastisements.

(Proved 1. Else they should not be guilty and accusable for losing the Fruit of merciful Corrections, when indeed it is a main mercy that they shall perish for not improving.

2. Else God would not make it the matter of a threatning to correct them or smite them no more (that is in that sort) because they revolt more and more, which yet he doth, *Ergo*, &c.

2. Punishment being the Action of a *Ruler* as such, and not of *Dominus Absolutus*, an Owner as such, (and so not formally and directly the act

act of God, as determining of events by his secret Decrees,) therefore they are to be specified and denominated from Rectoral ends, (which I call the ends of God's Legislative Will) rather than from the ends of God's Secret Decrees *de rerum eventu*.

Concl. 16. Hence it follows, that God may and doth remit much Temporal Punishment (both destructive and corrective,) even to the unregenerate (both Elect, and Non-Elect) taking an easier way to give the same mercy, which else he might have given in a sharper way; and so far he may be said to remit or forgive their sins: Though yet the Destructive Eternal Punishment being not forgiven, it is not fit in ordinary Speech to say, that such mens Sins are forgiven, without a limiting restrictive explication, because they are forgiven only *secundum quid*, and in the weakest Sense.

I have on occasion of this Text run quite beyond my first intentions in opening the nature and sorts of remission, but yet I hope not unprofitably.

From all this now it may appear, that as there are several sorts of Remission, so divers of them are Reversible and common to those that perish for ever. And now to the Text in hand.

1. It is apparent that this Text speaks of some of these sorts of Remission.

2. And that it speaks of a Remission reversible, or which may be conferr'd on those that afterward perish. And though I presume not to determine which of them it is that is here meant, yet

3. It is certain that which ever it be, it is the fruit of Christs blood shed for them to whom it is given, for without blood there is no Remission. The Law of Works remitteth not, for it relaxeth not its own obligation. And God relaxeth it not but upon satisfaction, as a valuable Consideration. And therefore it is relaxed by the New Testament in the blood of Christ, for that Testament is founded in his blood. But for the sense of the Text, I judge that the Forgiveness there mentioned, is the second and third sort; that is, the Conditional Universal Grant of Pardon by the New Covenant; (for the Covenant is the same in its Tenour to Unbelievers, and Believers; there is no real change in it when men believe, only the same instrument doth then morally act, that is, actually remit sin, which before it did not, because it was suspended on a Condition which was not performed. But Christ hath done his part as Testator, Donor, and Legislator before in making the Grant.) And so it is applicable differently to different Persons. To those that have only the Conditional Remission, and have not yet performed the Condition; it tells them eventually what shall be their miserable case if they do not perform it (which too oft comes to pass). To them that do believe, and so are inceptively Justified and Pardoned, Christ speaks as a Legislator and Teacher, supposing the possibility of their not performing the Condition of the Continuance of Justification, and tells them what will be their misery if they perform it not, though yet he may, as to the event, never

less Decree to cause them effectually and infallibly to perform it.

Seeing I have spoken so much here of Forgiveness, I shall refer you to it, when I come to speak of other Texts of the like sense.

I might here add (lest any upon any other interpretation of this Text, should think it of no weight) that other Scriptures do expresly assert some kind of Remission to the Wicked, upon their half Repentance; as to *Ahab*, the *Ninivites*; those *Heb.* 10. that were Sanctified by the Blood of the Covenant, *i. e.* purified; and those *Numb.* 14. 20. [I have pardoned them according to thy word] saith God of the whole People of *Israel*.

Yea, forbearance of Punishment, with hope and means for Everlasting Escape, is a sort of Remission. Those that say this Remission needed not the Sacrifice of Christ's Blood to procure it, do say that which they will never be able to prove.

The Tenth Text that I shall insist on is, 1 Tim. 4. 9, 10, 11. *This is a Faithful Saying, and worthy of all acceptation: For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all Men, specially of those that believe: These things command and teach.*

Davenant putteth in the frontispiece of his Dissertations, these words of *Prosper* on this Text, *qua sententia si tranquillo consideretur intuitu, tam controversiam dirimit. De vocat. Gent. li. 2. c. 31.*

Here its left past dispute, that by [all Men] is meant more than believers, for it is such an

[all Men] as is contradistinct from believers, even as the whole from a principal part. There is no room therefore left in this Text for any cavil or exception but this one, *viz.* whether by (Saviour) be not meant, (God the Father as the common preserver of his Creature, or of Mens natural lives)? Rather then Jesus Christ as Redeemer? This is commonly affirmed, and upon this ground, because it is only said (we trust in the living God who is the Saviour) and therefore say they, this proves not that Christ is a Saviour of all by his Death.

Answ. 1. Whether it be the Father or Son that is here spoken of, is no whit material, seeing God the Father Redeemeth and saveth by his Son, as the Son doth by himself. If it be spoken of saving the Soul, and not only the Body, then it's no matter which person it is spoken of: For God saveth none, but by the Death of his Son. Now that it is spoken *de Deo Redemptore*, and not only of God as preserver of Mens Bodies, I prove.

1. The word σωτὴρ, say then the generallity of Criticks, signifieth more then *Servator*, yea than *salvator*, and therefore *Laurentius* and *Grotius* turn it *sospitator*, and *Grotius* saith, that *servator & salvator* may be spoken of one that preserveth those that are safe and never were miserable, but so it is not here.

2. The same word is applied to God in the same manner of Speech, twice before in this same Epistle, and in both places is he called (a Saviour) in respect to Eternal Salvation, and not to Temporal only

1 *Tim.*

1 *Tim.* 1. 1. [*Paul an Apostle of Jesus Christ by the commandment of God our Saviour, and Lord Jesus Christ our Hope.* [1 Tim. 2. 3] *For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; Who will have all Men to be saved, and to come to the knowledg of the Truth For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Jesus Christ, who gave himself a Ransom for all, to be testified in due time.*) He that denieth that the Apostle doth in both these places call God a Saviour, in respect to Spiritual and Everlasting Salvation, is either very blind or perverse. And is it not fit for us to understand the same phrase used in the next Chapter save one as in the same Sense? If one Scripture must interpret another, sure it is. On 1 *Tim.* 1. 1. *Piscator* himself can expound the same Phrase thus [*observa nomen σωτῆρος servatoris etiam Patri tribui. Is enim servat nos per Filium: Quippe cum salutis nostra causâ misit, & per quem nos sibi reconciliavit, per quem etiam Spiritum Sanctum in nos misit.* [And will not an impartial Man then expound the same Phrase here in the same manner? Specially there being no reason to be brought from the Text to the contrary. Even so doth *Calvin* expound 1 *Tim.* 1. 1. and 2. 3. and generally all interpreters that I have observed. Yea let every place in the New Testament be examined where God the Father is called a Saviour, and it will be found to have reference to Everlasting Salvation, and not to temporal only. *Tit* 2. 10. *That they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things. For the grace of God that bringeth Salvation, hath appeared unto all Men*; Tit. 3. 4. *But after that the kindness*

and love of God our Saviour toward Man appeared not by works of Righteousness, which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour. Luke 1. 47. *My Soul doth magnify the Lord, and my Spirit hath rejoyced in God my Saviour.* So *Tit.* 1. 3. and *Jud.* 25. both in the same Sense: And I remember no more in the New Testament. And I think no considerate Man will in this case refer us to the Phrase of the Old Testament for exposition of the New, who knows and hath well weighed, how seldom and darkly Eternal Salvation in Heaven is mentioned in the Old Testament.

3. It seems manifest to me from the context that *Paul* meant it not only of a Temporal Salvation. For *Paul* makes this office of God, to be the reason of Christians constancy in labour and in suffering reproach for godlineſs sake. For the Apostle oft shews us that it was the hope of Glory and not of temporal deliverance that caused him to labour and suffer, and therefore he trusted here on God as a Saviour Everlasting, and not so much as a Temporal Saviour. For he professeth that he knew that wherever he went, bonds and afflictions did abide him: Yet did he not regard this, nor account his Life dear, that he might finish his course with joy. And on this ground he perswades Christians to be stedfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as they know that their labour was not in vain in the Lord: When as if in this Life only we had hope in Christ we were of all Men most miserable.

2. A

2. And indeed God is not a Saviour of all Mens Bodies in danger, by any obligation at all, that I know of. No, though they be wronged and suffer injustly: He doth what he doth of this kind for unbelievers arbitrarily: Let any Man shew where God is engaged by any Covenant to save unbelievers from bodily dangers. But their Souls he hath redeemed by Christ, and so saved them *quoad pretium*: And he hath made a Deed of Gift of Christ and Eternal Life to all, on condition they refuse it not. So that he may in respect of his Covenant, and so in a fuller Sense, be called their Saviour in Spiritual respects than in temporal; for all that they are not eventually saved. The word Saviour here implies such a Relation as God hath undertaken, and that Men may assure themselves he will perform all that belongs to it: Or else it could not be the ground of our confidence. But wicked Men have no promise for, or assurance of an hours Life, or any outward deliverance whatsoever; no, not though it were never so good for them: For God will not be in Covenant with them for common things till they first accept of his Covenant of Grace in Christ. But for Salvation, he hath made them a conditional promise, as aforesaid.

3. And it is less probable that the Apostle calls God a Saviour here so equivocally, as not to mean in the same kind of Salvation, when yet he intimateth no difference in the Text.

4. But let us suppose all this were as the opponents would have it, yet for ought I can see the Text will fully prove the point in question.

For even in temporal respects God is the Saviour of no Man but those whom Christ died for. For all Men have forfeited all his Salvation, and are under his Curse: And he can be no Saviour to them according to the tenor of that cursing violated Law. It must be therefore according to the New Law or Covenant, or not at all: And the New Law is founded in the Blood of Christ, shed for those to whom it is made. Indeed according to the first Law he may uphold the Life and Being of Sinners: But it is only as he doth the Devils, to make them capable of punishment. But neither do we for that, call him the Saviour of the Devils, nor would it be any such great encouragement to *Paul* and all Christians in labour and sufferings for godliness sake. So that even this Temporal Salvation, doth presuppose the Relaxation or Non Execution (Plenary) of the Law of Works: And that is done only by the remitting Law of Grace; and that presupposeth Christs Blood shed, or undertaken to be shed for the sinners. I know nothing more that needs to be spoken to, for vindicating this Text.

The 11th Text shall be 1 *Joh.* 5. 9, 10, 11, [*For this is the witness which he hath testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself. He that believeth not God hath made him a Lyar, because he believeth not the Record that God gave of his Son: And this is the Record, that God hath given us Eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son: He that hath the Son hath Life, and he that hath not the Son, hath not Life.*

Hence

Hence I thus argue: If Eternal Life in Christ be given to unbelievers (who make God a Lyar, and have not Christ or Life) then Christ was first given on the Cross as a Sacrifice, for those unbelievers. But the Antecedent is true: Therefore so is the Consequent. And consequently Christ died for more than the Elect; and therefore for all.

1. I Suppose none that is not willing to be deceived will maintain that it is only such unbelievers as afterward shall be converted, and are Elect, who are here said to make God a Lyar: For the Record which they are condemned here for not believing, is the object propounded to Elect and not Elect without such Distinction, as they are all considered in number of sinful Mankind.

2. As for the *Minor*, or Antecedent of the *Major* proposition, it is very plain in the Text. If all men should believe (who hear the Gospel) that Eternal Life in Christ is given them, and those that believe it not do make God a Lyar, then it's certain that Eternal Life in Christ is given to them all. But, *&c. Ergo, &c.* There is nothing here to be questioned, but only who are meant in the term [Us] when it is said [God hath given [Us] Eternal Life.] And it is plain that it is the same persons (included with others) who are charged with making God a Lyar.

1. Else their Unbelief should consist only in not believing that Life is given to other men; and consequently the Faith required of them should consist only in believing that God hath given Life in Christ to others; without any inclusion

inclusion of themselves. But that is not true. *Ergo, &c.* The falshood of this consequent, is proved thus.

1. True saving Faith is of a Receiving or Applying nature, as it is the act of the Will, and it is introductory thereto as it is the act of the Understanding. But believing that God hath given Life in Christ to other men, is not receptive nor applicatory, nor introductory thereto. *Ergo, &c.* All our Divines against the Papists do fully maintain the *Major*.

2. The Devils and the most despairing men have not saving Faith. But the Devils and Despairing men do believe that God hath given Eternal Life to others: therefore to believe that God doth give that Life to others is not saving Faith.

3. True saving Faith is of greatest concernment to the Believer (as to the object of it,) as being the means of his Salvation. But the believing meerly what God giveth to other men, is of no such concernment to any, *Ergo, &c.*

Obj. *It is not Saving Faith that is here mentioned; nor any act that is proper to a true Believer; nor is it the want of that which is here condemned: But it is the not believing the Truth of the Gospel, which is only a preparatory act, and which the Devils themselves may have, who believe and tremble: For though this meer assent will not save, yet the want of it will condemn.*

Answ. 1. Saving Faith hath two parts according

ing to the Souls faculties, which have each their ſeveral Offices about this ſaving object: the one is the aſſent of the Underſtanding: the other is the conſent of the Will, (and affiance thence following) when ever Juſtifying Faith is mentioned in the Scripture, it is uſually by one of theſe acts alone; ſometime one, and ſometime another. And when one only is expreſſed, the other is ſtill implied. And ſo it is in this Text.

2. Aſſent is true ſaving Faith, though not the whole of ſaving Faith.

3. It is not meerly aſſent to this propoſition in general [the Goſpel is true] that is here made the Record of God and object of Faith: nor yet aſſent to this [Jeſus is the Son of God, and Saviour of Believers.] But it is this [God hath given us Eternal Life, and this life is in his Son:] ſo that it is to believe that God hath made ſuch a Deed of Gift of Chriſt to us; that is, to Mankind, including our ſelves. Now no Devils do believe this; nor can ſay [God hath given us Eternal Life].

3. And where it may be ſaid that Wicked men may believe it.

I Anſwer, It is true, but not with that deep, intenſe, effectual, operative Belief, which is ſavingly ſincere when the Scripture requireth believing, and condemneth for want of it, it always implieth the neceſſary modification, even that the Act be in ſome meaſure anſwerable to the nature of its object. It ſtill means [ſincere, cordial believing] though it do not alway expreſs it; (nor were it convenient ſo to do.)

do.) And so undeniably doth this Text. And this Assent no wicked man can have.

4. The Text plainly evinceth the falshood of the objection, and shews that it is a saving Faith that is here mentioned, and is opposed to the Unbelief here condemned. For it saith [He that Believeth hath the witness in himself] which beyond dispute is the Holy Ghost, which is Christs great witness in the World, especially in the Souls of Believers. And it is the Holy Ghost in such a kind as is common to all true Believers; or else the proposition were not universally true; And this must needs be, if not only, yet chiefly, the Holy Ghost illuminating and sanctifying. And to this is the condemned Unbelief directly opposed in the next words, [He that Believeth not God, hath made him a Lyar.]

Here Amyraldus *and* Dallæus *coming forth stept me.*

CHAP. VIII.

Arguments against Universal Satisfaction answered.

Argum. I. *ALL those are certainly saved for whom Christ Satisfied: But all men are not Saved: Therefore Christ Satisfied not for all men.*

The *Major* is proved thus: It will not stand with Gods Justice to punish one sin twice, or

to

to punish twice for one sin; the first punishment being a full satisfaction for that sin. God can require no more: But Christs sufferings were a full satisfaction for every sin of those persons for whom he suffered: *Ergo, &c.* The Satisfaction was full.

1. In respect of the sins of the person; there being none unsatisfied for.

2. As to God who was offended; he being fully reconciled, or well-pleased, with the Sinners for whom the Satisfaction was made, and not only conditionally or in part.

Answ. This is the main Argument urged by Dr. *Twiss* and most others against Universal Satisfaction; and which prevaileth most with those of that way, so far as I can find: But it is grounded on an unhappy ignorance of the Nature of Satisfaction, and a confounding of satisfaction and solution of the proper Debt; and a sore mistake about Christ's undertaking and performance.

Solutio ipsius debiti, strictè sic dicta, the proper discharge of what was due, was *supplicium ipsius Delinquentis,* and not of any other in his stead (as I have proved before:) The Law did neither Threaten the Innocent, nor make any mention of a Surety. And therefore Christ did not fulfill the Law, in Suffering as he did in Obeying; or the Law was not properly fulfilled on Christ in his Suffering. Satisfaction is taken sometime generally, for the fulfilling of anothers desire: and so a Believing, Repenting, Obedient person, may be truly said to satisfie God himself. But this is not all the sense of the word

as

as it's now in question with us in the present case.

2. Sometimes it is taken specially, for a debtors satisfying his Creditor (not by submission and deprecation, but) by such a sufficient way, as that the Creditor shall be no loser by him. From a Creditor and Debtor it is by translation applied to a Rector and Delinquent. In this special sense Satisfaction is taken.

1. Sometime more loosely and largely for the Payment of the proper Debt: the same with *Solutio ipsius Debiti.* Or,

2. More strictly and properly: For the Satisfying the Creditor by giving him as good a thing, or taking such a course as that he shall be no loser, though the Debt be not paid. And in this sense is the word Satisfaction ordinarily used, as its proper strict sense, the former sense being one of them too general, and the other improper and loose. And so Satisfaction is commonly by Lawyers and Schoolmen defined to be *Redditio æquivalentis, alias indebiti*: or *solutio vel Redditio tantidem*: and it is contradistinguished from *solutio strictè sumpta*; which is *ejusdem quod debetur.* And so in Criminal Cases, the Punishment of the Offender is the *Ipsum Debitum*, and not properly satisfaction to the Comminatory part of the Law; (though all Punishment may be called a satisfaction as to the Preceptive part of the Law, because it is not the *ipsum quod debetur*, as to the Precept, but something to provide that the Law and Lawgiver lose not by the delinquent:) But if any other sufficient means be found which, without the Punishment of the offender, may provide for the Indemnity of the Lawgiver,

giver, and the publick good, and this both for what is past by reparation, and for time to come by Prevention, that so the main ends of the violated Law may yet be attained, this is satisfaction to the Lawgiver; Satisfaction alway supposeth the non-payment of the Debt: And in Criminal Cases (as ours is) satisfaction still supposeth the Duty, or Punishment, or both to be overpassed which the Law required. The Punishment of the Delinquent himself, (which may be called a satisfaction to the Law) supposeth that the Precept was violated, by Omission or Commission. The punishing of another for us, or any other such Satisfaction, supposeth the Delinquent himself not to be punished. So that it must needs be remembred by all true Christians, that Christ did not only satisfie for our not obeying, but for our not suffering the Punishment threatened by the Law, and so due to us for our disobedience: yea most directly did he Suffer for our not Suffering, and so secondarily for our Sinning. Further it must be remembred, that *satisfactio est solutio Recusabilis; sed solutio ejusdem est non recusabilis*; The Creditor or Rector may chuse to take satisfaction, by receiving the value in another kind: But he cannot refuse the proper Debt, unless by remitting it freely: He can require nothing else but the Debt: Moreover, satisfaction being a refusable payment, the Creditor may take it on his own terms, and there must intercede a New Agreement for the accepting of it, and if the Satisfier will not come to the Creditors terms, he may refuse it, as no satisfaction: whereas if the Debt it

self

self be paid, he must *ipso facto* acknowledge the Debtor acquit and to be no longer a Debtor: The like may be said in the Punishment of a Delinquent. To apply all to the case in hand: Christ was not the offender, therefore Christs Sufferings (as is said before) were not the fulfilling of the Law; but satisfaction to the Law-giver. His Satisfaction supposeth that no man was himself Punished when Christ satisfied (morally by undertaking his natural suffering) nor ever was to be punished meerly on the old score; that is, meerly for violating and incuring the penalty of the first Law, by God as Rector according to that Law. God might have refused to accept Christs Sufferings as a Satisfaction for Sinners; much more, to have freely provided it out of his own Treasure, as it were; when God therefore did freely himself provide a Satisfaction, and freely Accept it, He did both only on these terms; that [as Legislator of the strict Law of Works as standing without remedy, he would punish no Man, but yet he would not actually and absolutely discharge them, for they are still his Subjects; and now by a double right and bond, *viz.* both of Creation, and Redemption, and therefore must still be governed by him, and therefore must still be Governed by Laws, and therefore must still be under Precepts, Prohibitions, Promises, and Threatnings, which are the Parts of the Law. For the Nature of Man is such, as that it must be governed not meerly by Commanding, but also *per Præmia & Pœnas*, (Experience tells us that of the best Men on Earth) as propounded to them; therefore God

God in mercy would make a New Law, commanding all men to repent, and (that hear the Gospel) to Believe; and giving to the Redeemed the actual pardon of all their Sins on these Conditions, making Christ the Fountain of our Life, and Head of all that shall be Saved, and Ordaining that Christ, and with him Pardon and Adoption, and the Spirit, (for further Sanctification) and Salvation, shall be given to all that will take Christ, and that those that refuse him shall be unpardoned for all his Sacrifice and Satisfaction, and shall moreover incur a far sorer punishment.

These are the terms on which God took Christ's Sufferings as satisfactory to his Justice, which terms are well pleasing to the Son himself, nor did he ever desire to ransom them on other terms, or to bring them into any other Condition, than under this his own Government and Laws, nor to convey Pardon and Glory (the Fruits of his Death) to any that refused him; (still supposing his Everlasting secret Decree of procuring his chosen infallibly to perform the Conditions, and partake of the benefits which belongs to another part of Theology.)

Also it must be well observed (as the very Principal Point for avoiding the common Errours in this business) that the satisfaction is made to God as *Legislator*, and so *Rector per Leges*; and so hath its main direct respect to his Legislative Will. His Will *de Eventu* is naturally Antecedent to it, and the Cause of it as Event: But his Law was the cause or occasion of it, as due or morally necessary; and also there

are no Acts of his Decretive Will *de Eventu* caused by it, but there are Acts of his Law (and so as to our manner of conceiving of his Will *de Debito*) caused by it; and so it was not for Christ's Death that God decreed to give Faith to any, and consequently to give actual Pardon and Glory: But God Decreed to give these for Christ's death, when he so gives them: And it is because of Christs death that they are due; though not immediately from his death, but *mediante dominio Testamenti vel fœderis*, Christ's death is the Cause of Faith, but not of the Decree to give it.

Again it must be understood, that it is not God as Legislator of the New Law, that is satisfied for Sin by Christ's death, that were to dye to satisfie himself, the Mediator, for the Non-execution of his own remedying Law: But it is God as Legislator of the Law of Works; constituting Everlasting Death the due Penalty of every Sin: Or if any had rather say, that it is not formally the Law of Works which is now in force, conjunct with the Law of Grace, but it is become part of the Law of Grace; the matter comes all to one sense, though we change the words: There is one Law that saith [*He that Sinneth shall dye,*] call it what you will; this Law is to the end Christ hath satisfied, *i. e.* he hath properly satisfied the Law-giver: There is another Law (or as they call it, the peremptory part of the New Law) which saith [*He that believeth shall be Saved, and he that believeth not shall be Damned*;] Christ hath not satisfied the Justice of this Law by his Sufferings. The sanction of the Commination is [*He that in the time of*

this Life believeth not shall be Damned.] This Law is ever executed on all that are guilty, and by it obliged to Everlasting Death; that is, on those that in their life time here, do not Repent and Believe. For the violation of the precept of this Law, as it requires Belief, or other Duty at the present time, Christ did dye, but not for the non-performance of the Condition which Death is threatned to.

Lastly, It is therefore certain that Christ dyed not for the Sin of Final Impenitency (in a prevalent degree) and unbelief, or Final Rebellion against himself, or his Father.

And therefore when I said before that he satisfyed God as Legislator of the Law of works, for sin as sin, it is to be understood of the Law of Works, as *contradistinct* from the Law of Grace; and so all the sins peremptorily Condemned by the Law of Grace, are excepted from the satisfaction: Not only (nor at all) because they are the sins of such Persons, but because they are such excepted sins, who ever the person be.

Now therefore to the Argument, and first to the Major, I deny it, and never saw any fair colour of proof of it; and therefore (having full plain Scripture to the contrary) do confidently believe, that all those are not Saved that Christ satisfied for; and to the Proof brought I answer,

1. It is untrue that Christ satisfied for every sin of every Man for whom he satisfied; and it will never be proved. He hath excepted all those Sins which are comprized in the final non-performance of the Condition of Salvation.

Object. *None that be satisfied for are ever guilty of that, and that's the Reason why he may not be said to dye for such Sins.*

Answ. That's denyed, and to be better proved before it can be received, by Sober Men. I have already proved that he dyed and satisfied for those that are final Unbelievers, or Apostates, and so perish. And I now prove that the Reason why Christ satisfied not for such sins (as final Impenitency, Infidelity, or Rebellion) is not accidental from the state of the Redeemed, *viz.* because none of them are guilty of such; but it is directly from the Nature of the sin, without respect to this person more than that.

If Christ have expresly excepted the final non-performance of the Gospel Conditions from among the number of those sins which he hath satisfied for, and that even in the New Law which he hath enacted for all (Elect, or Non-Elect,) then it is not only accidentally, or because it is not found in those he suffered for, but it is directly *à voluntate Dei Redemptoris & à Natura peccati*, because God would not accept, nor Christ give any satisfaction for that kind of Sin, (or for any sin so qualified or circumstantiated,) but the Antecedent is certain, therefore I prove the Antecedent thus: It is the very Nature of every Condition added to any Donation, Condonation, Premiant Law, &c. that it be or contain an exception of the Non-performance of that Condition from among the n··r of those things that are given, forgiven, constituted, due, &c. (Because the Condition

dition is to suspend the Gift 'till it be performed.) But the New Law or Testament as made to all (Elect, or Non-Elect) doth constitute this its Condition, *viz.* That all that will be Justified, Repent, and Believe, and take Christ affectionately, and thankfully for their only Lord and Saviour; and that all that will be Saved do persevere herein, and in adding further sincere Obedience to God's Laws: Therefore by making these the Conditions, the Law excepteth the non-performance thereof from among the number of those things that are given, forgiven, or granted thereby. And Consequently these sins are excepted from among the sins that Christ bore on the Cross, or satisfied for: For whatsoever kind of sin he hath satisfied for, he bestoweth the Pardon of it, Conditionally at least, (and that in his Law to them to whom his Law is made,) so far is he from making an expres exception of that from among the number of pardonable sins: But these he excepteth from among that number.

If a Man by Legacy give you 1000*l. per annum*, on Condition you pay his Heir out of it an 100*l. per annum*, Rent: Here this 100*l. per annum* is expresly excepted from the Sum given, because the payment of it is required as the Condition of enjoying the rest.

If a Man to whom you owe 1000*l.* make you an Acquittance and Discharge, on Condition you pay him a Penny in token of thankfulness, here that Penny is plainly excepted from among the number, or from the Sum given, or forgiven.

If a King pass an Act for the pardoning of all Offences committed against him, on Condition Men will thankfully acknowledge his Clemency; here the not acknowledging it thankfully is plainly excepted from among the number of Faults Pardoned.

2. Moreover this Law being thus constituted for all, (Elect as well as others) it is undoubted, that if we may suppose an Elect man to be guilty of final unbelief, or impenitency, it would be to him an unpardonable sin, and consequently Christ dyed not for it..

If you say, this is not to be supposed, I Answer,

1. It is *supponendum*, though not *ponendum*.

2. The Holy Ghost supposeth it possible (*etsi non futurum*) in that the Law is made to them as well as others; and in that he expresly requires them so oft to take heed lest they fall, and come short of the Promised Rest, through unbelief, *&c.*

And therefore we also may put such a Supposition. Do not those that oppose us in this, use so to Expound such Scriptures, frequently, both about Redemption, and when they Dispute against the Apostacy of the Saints; and say it is supposed only; but *Suppositio nil ponit in esse*: Moreover the Scripture makes it plain, that these Sins of Total Apostacy, and other unpardonable (because uncurable) Sins, are in them for whom Christ dyed: For *they bring on themselves swift Destruction, by denying the Lord that bought them: They tread under foot the Blood by which they were Sanctified, and do despite to the Spirit of Grace; and so there remaineth*

eth no more Sacrifice for (their) *Sin, but a fearful looking for of Judgment.* So that is is plain that Christ dyed not for all the Sins of all Men for whom he dyed, excepting by his new Law, the final *Non-performance* of the Conditions of the Promise, in whomsoever without exception. Yea, Christ's real giving all Men under his hand the Pardon of all their Sins, on Condition they Repent and Believe; shews beyond all doubt, that he bore on the Cross all their other Sins, but bore no Man's final Impenitency, or Unbelief.

2. And the other Principle, which is supposed in this Argument of Christ's satisfying God to a full Reconciliation) is as false as the former, and in the best Sense needs cautelous explication.

1. It is certain that no Man is actually reconciled to God, Pardoned or Justified 'till he believe, (or others Believe for him, as Infants at least so far as is revealed,) God still hateth all the workers of Iniquity, and we are all by Nature the Children of Wrath. By receiving Christ, we receive power to become the Sons of God, and by Faith only are we justified, and not before we believe: And who but the *Antinomians* will say the contrary?

2. The end to which God (as Legislator of the Old Law) accepted satisfaction, was that the impediments of Remission being taken out of the way, he might (without any derogation from the honour of himself, or his Law, and without frustration of the ends of that Law) give out in a New Law, a Free Pardon and Salvation with Christ to all that will accept

them. So that the end of satisfaction as such, and not any accidental or collateral effect must direct us to judge of its extent and sufficiency.

3. To this end Christ hath made full satisfaction to God's Justice, and Mens After-Sufferings, are not from any defect in Christ's satisfaction. God hath granted a Pardon under his hand to all that will accept it in and with Christ, and for Mens final rejecting of Christ and Mercy he received no satisfaction. God may not be said properly to be conditionally satisfied: He is satisfied actually and absolutely, as far as ever he required satisfaction. But the Benefits of that satisfaction are only conditionally given out to the Ransomed, and not absolutely. If it be objected that God is so far satisfied as to give Faith it self, which is the Condition to all for whom he is satisfied.

I *answ.* 1. It is untrue: and never was proved, nor ever will be.

2. Faith is a remote effect of Satisfaction, and not the proper direct effect: It floweth not from Satisfaction as Satisfaction; but from Satisfaction as connexed with Election, as I shall anon more fully open, and therefore desire the Reader, to peruse what we shall purposely write of that point by it self.

I deny therefore their great *Medium*, that [God cannot in Justice punish one sin twice] that is [for one sin] (for it is not the sin that is punished, but the man for the sin.) Though I easily grant that if the violated Law be once fully executed, it cannot be again or in a double measure executed (for that's impossible as being

ing a contradiction: for it is no execution of the Law, which goes beyond the sense of the Law.)

But consider 1. The Law was not executed on Christ in his sufferings; and therefore may well be executed on all Unbelievers in their own damnation. Christ did by his Sufferings only pay, as it were that which is a valuable consideration, for the non-execution of the Law as to all that will perform the conditions of the Gospel or New Law.

Obj. *Did not Christ bear the Curse of the Law for us, that he might Redeem them that were under the Law?*

Answ. Yes, he bore the Curse of the Law Materially; that is, that Cursed Death which the Law threatned; But he bore it not *ex formali Legis obligatione, sed tantum ex obligatione sponsionis propriæ, & præcepti paterni*; The Law obliged us to punishment, but it never obliged Christ to Punishment; only its obliging us to it, was the occasion of Christs Obligation, because it occasioned him to Oblige himself by his own voluntary sponsion, that he might free us. But still it was only his own sponsion that obliged him (together with that peculiar will of his Father, that he should undertake and discharge our debt;) so that you see the Law is but once executed, even on the Damned (as to full execution, for mans mortality and sufferings here, are a small part of the Execution which Christ saw it not meet to take off) And so the *ipsum Debitum* is paid but once; Christs Sufferings

Sufferings being not *solutio ejusdem, sed satisfactio, i. e. solutio æquivalentis aliàs indebiti.*

2. Nay, consider further, that the equivalency lay not in the proportion of Punishment (pain or loss) equal to that which was due to all or to the Elect; but in the sufficient aptitude of that Degree or Punishment, which Christ bore (becoming a publick spectacle of shame, for the demonstration of Justice, &c.) from the exceeding Dignity of the person, to be a means to Gods obtaining the remote ends of his Law, (*viz.* the demonstration of Justice, and right governing the Creature, and preserving the Authority of the Lawgiver) though the neareſt ends of that Law were not attained (*viz.* the personal obedience of man, and for want of that, his personal suffering.) Many Learned Divines have written largely to prove that Christ did not properly suffer the pains of Hell on his Soul; I will not meddle much with that question; But doubtless it was a very great part of our punishment which Christ was uncapable of undergoing; much less may any dare to affirm that his Sufferings Materially were as great as All the Sufferings of All that he died for should have been. The Death due to us was Temporal, Spiritual, and Eternal. The Temporal Death is so much the least, that many Divines will not be perswaded that it hath now to the Godly any nature of Punishment, but is only materially a suffering. The Spiritual Death, so far as it consisted in the loss of Gods Image, and privation of Holiness, and Dominion of Sin and Slavery to Satan, Christ bore not at all. Nor yet as it lay in any Torments

ments or Gripes of Conscience, which are the fruits only of personal proper guilt, in the remembrance of the Folly, or Wilfulness, or Negligence, or Unkindness, or the like Evils manifested in Sinning. Christ had no sin of his own to look on to torment him: and other mens Sins could not procure to him the gripes of a Guilty Conscience. Nor yet was his Soul or Body so deprived of Gods Love as are the wicked, nor so hated by God, nor at all disunited from God: For upon the loss of Union with God, and Spiritual Communion with him, would have followed, the loss of Grace, and depravation of the Soul, and prevalency of sin: nor yet were any of Christs sufferings Eternal. Yet did he endure that debasedness and publick shame, and that forsaking of God by the denial of Spiritual Comforts, and by giving him up to the Will of his Enemies, and by an inward sense of Gods displeasure, in trouble of Soul, which was a full satisfaction to Justice, or a Sacrifice sufficient for God to do what he did, upon the reception of it. But you see that *quoad Materiale pœnæ* there was much difference between Christs Sufferings and the Damneds in Hell.

3. Consider Christs sufferings being not *solutio ipsius Debiti* but *satisfactio*; as is before explained, therefore it was *solutio recusabilis*, God might have chosen to accept it; and there must intercede, as it were, a new agreement for its acceptance. Now God did accept it, and Christ suffer it only on these terms, that none should for all that have the Pardon of his sins, till he accepted Christ as his Lord Redeemer and Repented of his sins: and this is the true reason why Christs

Christs Satisfaction, is no hinderance to the punishment of those that reject him and his favours.

4. The Satisfaction of Christ is sufficient and perfect *ad suum finem*, to all its own ends, but not *ad omnem finem*, to every use and end: and it was not its use and end to acquit *ipso facto* any sinner, but only to acquit all on condition of Repenting and Believing, (it being also the full intent of God to give that condition to all his Elect, as shall be anon opened.) Some very Wise, Godly, and Learned men that I have spoke with, wish that the Word [Satisfaction] had been never here used, but instead of it the terms of [an Expiatory or Propitiatory Sacrifice:] because the last is the Scripture phrase and the first is not: But yet Satisfaction is no such unfit term but that it may well be used, though still Scripture phrase I confess is better.

5. As Christ hath satisfied the Father, so the Father hath satisfied Christ (in the larger sense, *i. e.* he hath fulfilled his desire.) It was not man himself that satisfied, but Christ for man; nor did Christ satisfie in our person, as a delegate pays a Debt in the Debtors name, so as in Law-sense *Civiliter*, it is the Debtor himself that pays it; For then it should have been *Solutio* not *Satisfactio*; There being no *Vicarius Pœnæ* allowed by the Law, it is indeed impossible, for such a solution to be made; For it should be the *Idem* and not the *Idem quod debetur, quia non naturaliter per eundem*, and consequently not *civiliter per eundem*. Yet a satisfaction may be made by suffering *alterius loco*; and so Christ did. But as Christ suffered in his own person, *viz. Sponsoris*, and not our selves; so the effect that be

he desired was, that he might himself be the first *Recipient* of the fruits of that satisfaction (in that sense as he is capable of receiving them) that he might be the Head and the publick Treasury of all the Mercy procured by his Death; and being made Lord of all, might give them out to whom, and when, and how he pleased; and in special, that he might make a general Deed of Gift of himself, and Pardon and Salvation to All that would accept it, and might send forth the Spirit and Word to bring in men to himself in what measure he please; and in particular in an infallible prevalency to his chosen: And that none might perish merely on the old score, or be judged meerly by the Old Law; but all stand or fall according to their improvement or abuse of recovering Mercy. And all this God hath hereupon granted to his Son: And so he hath satisfaction for his satisfaction; though many that he hath satisfied for do perish.

6. Besides consider, though men be punished for the same sins that Christ suffered for, yet as to God, the same do become new sins, and so men suffer for them as it were, as for new sins: For,

1. The old Obligation was so far made void or disabled, that of it self it could never more bind them to punishment, by reason of the addition of a remedying grant.

2. God did *quantum in se* as Legislator of the old Law, forgive them all the debt, (except the sins of non-performance of the Gospel conditions, which God still excepted and Christ never suffered for) for God hath delivered the obligation out of his own hand (as standing in that

that first Relation of *Rector secundum Legem Naturæ primum*) and given it up into the hand of the Redeemer, to give Remission to whom he please. He hath also made a free Deed of Gift of an Universal Pardon, to all that will accept it. So that though men be not actually pardoned, yet God may conveniently be said to have pardoned them, in that he did his part as *Rector secundum Legem*. As he saith to *Israel*, *I have healed thee and thou art not healed.* When a true Believer is actually Pardoned, God doth put forth no new act to Pardon him, but doth it by the general Grant or Act of Oblivion, whereby he Pardoned All men conditionally as well as them. The Law, saith a man, hath done a thing or given a benefit when he hath done his part, though the effect follow not, and the Work be yet undone: For Moral Causes may do all their part, and yet the effect not follow, for want of the performance of conditions in the receiver, or because con-causes do not their part. And therefore if the effect follow not, the Law enquires, Who it is long of? Whose fault was it? if of the Patient or Receiver, then the Donor or Agent is said to have done the thing, though yet it be not done. For as to him *moraliter vel Civiliter* it is done: There being no default on his part. If any say that God followeth not the Rules of Humane Laws. I answer, God is the Fountain of all right Laws, and Reason, and Justice, and I speak not of any unjust or mistaking Laws. This is an ill pretence for men to judge their Maker by; when they will not allow him that reasonable apology, nor make that construction of his

ways

ways according to common undeniable equity, as they will do of the ways of men. Right Reason, and the Laws made thereby, are a beam of Gods perfect Wisdom and Justice. If any say that God doth not *Totum quod ad se attinet*, all his part, in making a Deed of Gift of Christ and Pardon, and Glory, to all that will accept it, unless he also give Faith which is the acceptance it self. I shall now only say this much (till we come to the point by it self) that God doth *Totum quod ad se attinet ut Legislatorem vel Rectorem juxta Leges*, all that belongs to him as Rector according to Laws; (though not all that belongs to him as absolute Lord and Disposer of events and all Creatures.) And it is in that Respect, *sub ratione Rectoris* that Christ made satisfaction to him, and not in the ratione the Relation of an Eternal-Elector or Absolute Proprietary and Disposer of all.

So that you see now that *quoad Deum* all men are pardoned all their sins (except those excepted in the conditions of the Grant,) though *quoad delinquentis Receptionem* they are still unpardoned. They may have Christ and Pardon if they will. And when they are deprived of the Gift meerly because they will not have it, no Reason can say, God did not give it, or Christ did not procure it, or that God is unjust in that they are without it. So that it is not now meerly the obligation of the first Law, as unremedied that binds them over to punishment, nor as it is in the Hands of God as Creator or Rector *secundum Legem operum*; but it is the Obligation of the new Law primarily (He that believeth not shall not be forgiven nor be saved)

ed) and consequently of the Old Law, as the obligation is in the Redeemers hands to be charged only on the Rejecters of Grace. It is not primarily for sin as sin, according to this Law; [Whosoever sinneth shall dye,] but it is primarily for Rejecting the Remedy, and then that sin, by necessary consequence remains unpardoned: so that it is not directly because they were guilty of Death by the first Law, but *propter rejectam Remissionem* for despising the Remission of that guilt. So that *quoad Deum* it may be called the return of Sin or Guilt Remitted, and so to be more properly *ex novâ obligatione* from the New Obligation of the Law of Christ, binding all their sins again upon them; though as to them and their reception it is both from the New Obligation and the old. And therefore *Jude* calleth such, twice dead, and pluckt up by the Roots. If an hundred Traytors be condemned, and the Prince Ransom them all at a Price, agreeing in the payment of it, that they shall now be all his own, and none of them be delivered for all that, who will not thankfully own him and acknowledge his favour: Here it is just that all the Refusers of Pardon yet perish: And their Death is directly for the refusing of the Remedy, and secondarily from their old crime because they would not have it remedied. So that though *Materialiter* they lose but one Life, yet it may be said that the Life they now lose, *Civiliter* is not the same that before they lost; but it is *vitam de novo donatam*, a Life newly given them, for they were dead in Law, and the King gave them a new Life, *Moraliter etsi non naturaliter*,

Naturaliter. And it is the rejecting of the Gift by which they lose their former Natural Life, and their New-given Mortal Life. And will any man be so ill advised in this case as to say, that it is injustice in the King or Prince to punish the same persons that were before Ransomed? Yea if it were not by Money but by suffering publick shame that the Prince had Rantomed them.

Having thus Explained the Case, and Answered the Argument, I will (looking at Edification, and not the usual form of Disputing) go beyond the task of a meer Respondent, and give you two or three Arguments to prove that it is no injustice in God to punish those for whom Christ hath satisfied, or for whose sins he was a sacrifice.

And, 1. I argue thus; If it be no injustice in God to oblige men to punishment for all Christs satisfaction, then it is no injustice actually to punish men for all Christs satisfaction. But the former is true, therefore so is the latter.

First, I will prove the consequence of the *Major* Proposition thus; from the essential offices of the Law.

1. The Law is *Juris constitutiva, vel saltem declarativa*. It constituteth Right, or at least declareth right; (I put in the latter [declareth] not as my own sense, but to prevent the quarrel of any that may think this or any Right was constituted from Eternity before there was any Law, or at least before that which we say obligeth sinners to punishment. Though indeed

the Law doth constitute before it declare) And so the Law is *Regula justitiæ, vel saltem regula justa*: And if so, then to execute such a Law can be no injustice.

2. The Law is *Norma judicii*; that's past question. I speak of a Law in force, and as to the subjects to whom it is in force. And if so, then it can be no injustice to execute it. But I think few sober men will deny the *Major*, and therefore I leave that. And one would think none should doubt of the *Minor*: Whether it be any injustice in God, by his Law to oblige to punishment those that Christ Died for? But because the *Antinomians* deny it, let us prove it. If God do *de facto* oblige to punishment those for whom Christ Died, then it is no injustice so to do: But God doth so actually, *Ergo*, &c.

I hope if we prove that God doth it, none dare say it is unjust. If he be not Just he is not God. And that God doth it I prove thus.

1. Those that God Hateth, and are Children of Wrath, and without Hope, and without God in the World, and Strangers to the Covenant of Promises, and Aliens to the Common-Wealth of *Israel*, &c. are certainly obliged to punishment: But such many have been and still are, for whom Christ Died, *Ergo* &c. *God hateth all the workers of Iniquity*, and they are all by Nature *Children of Wrath*, &c. But many that Christ Died for, are before Regeneration workers of Iniquity, *Ergo*, &c.

2. All that are under the Curse of the Law are obliged to punishment. But many that Christ Died for, were under the Curse of the Law

Law since his Death, undertaken (when his satisfaction was in force) yea since his actual suffering; *Ergo.* &c. Many Scriptures shew both that we were under the Curse of the Law when Christ actually suffered, and that all the Elect are under it still as well as others, till their conversion. I am loth to trouble the Reader in heaping up Testimonies.

3. All that are condemned already, and the Wrath of God abideth on them, are doubtless obliged to punishment. But such are many for whom Christ Died; (even all the Elect as well as others, while they are unbelievers, *John* 3. 18.

4. All that are guilty are obliged to punishment: (Proved, *Reatus est obligatio ad panam*, they are all one thing) But some that Christ Died for are Guilty. *Ergo*, &c. Even all before pardon, and that is all before Conversion are guilty.

5. All those whose sins Christ doth pardon were first guilty or obliged to punishment. But, some that Christ Died for have their sins pardoned. *Ergo*, &c.

The *Minor* is proved beyond all doubt from the formal Nature of Pardon, which is the Remitting of Guilt, or the Dissolving of an Obligation to punishment; therefore where is no such obligation there can be no Dissolution of it: For that which is not, cannot be dissolved: And so there is no capacity for pardon; no more than a living man can be raised from the Dead, or a Man cured of a Disease, which he never had. The like may be said of Justification also. Our Divines have fully proved

against the *Antinomians*, that we are unpardoned, and unjustified till we believe: We are Justified by Faith, and therefore were unjustified before Faith.

6. If none be obliged to punishment for whom Christ Died, then none such may pray for Pardon, nor confess that they need any Pardon from Christ. (For Pardon being the dissolving of an obligation to punishment, there can be no pardon, where there is no obligation; and therefore no need of it, nor of prayer for it) But the consequent is very wicked: We must daily pray, *Forgive us our Debts and Trespasses*: *Ergo*, &c.

The Second Argument is this, If God do actually punish those for whom Christ Died, then he may justly punish them. But God doth actually punish such; *Ergo*, &c.

The *Major* is unquestionable.

The *Minor* is fully proved thus.

1. The express words of Scripture shew it, *Lev.* 26. 41, 43. *Lam.* 3 39. and 4. 6, 22. *Amos* 1. 3, 6, 9, 11, 13. and 2. 1, 4, 6. 2 *Cr.* 2. 6. 1 *Pet.* 2. 14. *Jer.* 44. 13. *Ezra.* 9. 13. *Hos.* 4. 9, 15. *Jer.* 9 25. Read the places.

2. The execution of that sentence, *Gen.* 3. 16, 17, 18 19. is certainly punishment. [*I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy Conception, in sorrow thou shalt bring forth Children*, &c. *Cursed is the ground for thy sake, in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy Life*, &c. *Dust thou art, and to Dust shalt thou return.*] But this sentence is executed on those that Christ Died for, *Ergo*, &c.

3. Those

3. Those whom God chastiseth he punisheth: But he chastiseth those whom Christ Died for. *Ergo*, &c.

The *Major* is undeniable to all that know what chastisement and punishment is: Punishment is the *Genus* (being a Natural Evil, or the privation of a Natural Good, inflicted for a Moral Evil, the privation of a Moral Good:) Rigorous vindictive Punishment tending most to the ruine of the Sinner, is one species of it, Chastisement is another species, which, by the hurt of a sinner tendeth to his good. And though this be called Paternal, yet, 1. Chastisement is not the proper act of Parents. Masters may Chastise Servants, and Princes their Subjects. 2. It is Metaphorically called Paternal in one respect, as God exerciseth it; when yet in other respects it is the act of God as *Rector per Leges*, for so all Gods Chastisements are according to his Laws.

Object. *All shall work together for good to them that Love God, to the Called, &c. therefore nothing is Punishment.*

Answ. 1. The best Interpreters (according to the plain truth) expound that Text of Affliction only, and most of such Affliction as is suffered for Christs cause, or at least not for hainous sinning against God. And it is unlikely it should be otherwise.

1. Because the defect of Love to God seems excepted in limiting it to them that love God: But one that Christ Died for may be defective

in love to God, therefore that is not promised to work for good.

2. Every Man dieth in some sin, and how that should do him good is hard to discern.

3. If we had a Promise that sin and all should work for the best, then we had no evil to fear, nor avoid, nor pray against, nor lament; but that is not true.

4. Such a Promise would be a dangerous encouragement to sin; if every Christian knew by promise before hand that how much soever they sinn'd it should be better for them than if they had not sinned.

5. The good of a Christian lyeth in the enjoyment of God, by knowledge, love, joy, &c. therefore his want of knowledge, love, &c. is not that which is Promised shall work for the best.

6. It is possible for a believer by Revolting to decline in Grace, and consequently in Happiness; (else we need not fear declining nor lament it.) But if sin should all work for the best to them, then it were impossible their Happiness could decline: for nothing but sin, or so much as sin can cause it.

7. They that have least improved their Talents, and have least Grace, shall have least Glory: God is enjoyed hereafter in various degrees according to mens various capacities; therefore that defect of Grace, or that sin here which caused their less degree of Glory did not work for their greater good. Yet I confess, 1. That God may and oft doth make sin an occasion of good to his People. 2. And always brings good out of it to his own Glory; But he hath not

Promised

Promised that every believers sin shall work together for good to him.

8. The word [working together] expresseth a causality, and a concausality with God, which cannot be ascribed to sin, it being at the best but an occasion of good.

2. If this Promise were so to be understood, it were nothing against what I say: And if it do extend to all sufferings as well as those for Christ, yet it is not against it. For it proves no more but that they are chastisements that shall produce a greater good than the suffering is evil. But yet chastisements are punishments, and the evil is still evil though it occasion good: It is evil in it self or directly, it doth us good but by accident. Or whatsoever you conclude of chastisements in suffering, certainly it is a heavy Punishment when God permitteth his People to sin (as he did *David*, *Peter*, &c.) yet such as Christ hath Died for do suffer this Punishment. Again, is not Original sin the loss of Gods Image, and the pravity of Nature a Punishment for the first sin? I mean Gods withdrawing his Grace, which is the Antecedent.

Lastly, If all this were nothing as to the Regenerate, yet who ever said that God never punisheth any of his Elect while they are Unregenerate? Are none of their sins Original or Actual, nor any of their sufferings or disunion from Christ and Alienation from God, punishments to them? It is beyond all dispute. I conclude therefore that it is a point of undeniable evidence, that God doth actually punish some, yea all for whom Christ Died; and he doth it justly. And therefore it is not injustice to

punish men that Christ Died for, (meerly as if God could not do it, lest he punish twice for one sin.

Object. *But the great Punishment of everlasting Death, would be injustice, though lesser be so.*

Answ. Degrees here make but a gradual difference. If it be therefore injustice to inflict punishment because Christ hath satisfied for the sin, then a lesser punishment would be a lesser injustice: But God is as uncapable of the least injustice as of the greatest.

3. The Third Argument; It is no injustice in God to make a Law to those that Christ Died for, which threatneth Punishment to them conditionally, and commandeth them to fear it, and avoid it; therefore it is no injustice in God to punish some for whom Christ Died. The Antecedent is doubtless because God doth actually make such Laws as threaten to all both Temporary and Everlasting punishments. If it be said that [they threaten none but final Unbelievers; and Christ Died for none such.] I answer, (to omit the begging of the Question in this Objection) Gods new Law threatneth Temporal Punishment to those that are not such Unbelievers, and Eternal Punishment conditionally to All; *viz.* If they believe not: And it threatneth no man but conditionally, for the discovery of absolute Non-election, and the certainty of the perishing of all the Non-elect, is not properly a threatning but a Prediction; yet improperly may be called a threatning: Even as the discovery of absolute Election, and

of

of the certainty of the Salvation of all the Elect, is improperly called a Covenant or Promise; which is properly a Prediction *de eventu* only, not constitutive of any Right. If the whole New Law (*He that believeth shall be Saved, and he that believeth not shall be Damned*) be made to all, Elect as well as others; and must be preached or promulgate to every Creature, then the comminatory part is made to all, Elect, as well as others: But the Antecedent is true, *Ergo*, &c.

2. For the Consequence of the Argument, I need not say much more than is said already in the first Argument.

Object. *But the Elect will all certainly Believe, and therefore God cannot justly execute that threatning on them.*

Answ. 1. But he may on others, for whom Christ satisfied.

2. The reason why he cannot on them, is not properly because they are satisfied for, but because they believe, and so are not the proper subjects of the penalty.

3. They will certainly believe; not meerly or directly because Christ satisfied for them; but because God hath chosen them to Faith and Salvation, and Christ in Dying for them had a peculiar intent of saving them infallibly, and giving them Faith to that end; they being given him peculiarly by his Father.

4. The Fourth Argument is the same that I have elsewhere handled, *viz.* If it be injurious

or

or unjust to punish the same man for whom Christ Died, then it is *injurious to some one*: But it is injurious to no one; therefore it is not unjust or injurious at all.

The *Major* is evident. All injury is an injury to some, and so is all injustice injurious to some.

Object. *It may be that injustice which is contrary to Vertue or Universal Justice, though it be injurious to none.*

Answ. That's not so; for that Unrighteousness is injurious to God, and perturbeth the order of Nature, and is injurious to our selves. But this God is not to be conceived as capable of, seeing it consisteth in a disconformity to his will.

And, 2. It's apparent that it is Gods distributive Justice, as to men, and his commutative Justice as to Christ, which is here pleaded by Divines to prove a necessity of the Salvation of all that Christ Died for.

Let us therefore go to the proof of the *Minor* Proposition: And it is proved thus.

If Gods punishing the same men that Christ Died for be injustice or injurious, then it is either a wrong to God himself or to Christ the Redeemer, or else to the Sinners that perish: But it is no wrong to God the Father, Christ the Redeemer, nor the Sinner: Therefore it is no injustice nor wrong at all.

The *Major* consisteth of two parts, both which are beyond dispute.

1. That

1. That whatsoever is injurious, is injurious to some person or Society.

2. That the enumeration is sufficient in the present Case. None else can be imagined to be wronged but God, or the Redeemer, or the Sinner.

And, 1. That it is no wrong to God himself is past doubt, for God cannot and will not wrong himself.

Object. *But it would be contrary to the goodness of his Nature, and so contrary to himself, and to Universal Righteousness.*

Answ. Not so: There can nothing in Gods Nature be manifested which should necessitate or cause him certainly to save all that Christ Died for. Not his Justice, for that requires him to give every Man his Right. But I shall shew you that this was never the Right of all that Christ Died for, nay, I have shewed already that all of them are after Christs Dying for them actually obliged to punishment; so that punishment was then their Right. Not his truth: For he hath no where promised it.

2. It is no injury to Christ that some should perish for whom he Died.

1. Because it is his own will: He never intended to save any that he Died for, but only those that accept him and his benefits.

2. It is according to the contract (as we may improperly call it) between him and the Father. God never required nor accepted satisfaction, nor did Christ ever give it, but on these terms, that only those should be saved by it that accept

accept him and it. God hath done what he promised to the Redeemer. He hath delivered up all mens Obligations into the hands (*i. e.* the power and disposal) of Christ; and so hath remitted the Debt to all that will accept it: Christ may now give pardon to whom he please. It was not we, but Christ that made the satisfaction; and therefore it is not to us immediately that God hath delivered up the Obligation; but to Christ that satisfied. As it is usual among men, for a friend that is surety for another to have his obligation delivered to him for his own security. So hath Christ, that if Sinners prove unthankful rejecters of his kindness, he may punish them for it accordingly.

3. It is Christs own doing to condemn those for whom he Died: And he will not wrong himself. And he therefore doth it, because they will not accept him and his favour, nor thankfully acknowledge what he hath done for them.

4. No man can shew one word in Scripture where God hath promised Christ to save all that he Died for. I conclude therefore that God is no more bound to save all that Christ Redeemed, than to save all that himself Created: And the vulgar Argument of the Prophane [God did not make us to Damn us] or [God made us; therefore he will not Damn us] is as good as this [Christ Died for us; therefore he will not Damn us.]

3. That it is no injury or injustice to the Damned themselves is as easily manifested: (and yet here is all the shew of injury that is.)

1. It

1. It is no wrong to give men their due: But Damnation is the due of all Unbelievers; even those that Christ Died for: Therefore it is no wrong for God to Damn them. The *Major* is past doubt. The *Minor* is as clear as any point that I know in the Gospel. A single obligation makes it their due: but here is a double obligation.

1. That of the Law of Works, obliging them to Death as Sinners: which is not dissolved because they accepted not of Pardon in and with Christ: and so they are condemned already: For none is pardoned till he Believeth: and Punishment remaineth due, till men be Pardoned.

2. The obligation of the new Law both binding their former guilt on them by a peremptory irreversible Decree, and condemning them for contempt of recovering Mercy, to a sorer Punishment: This last I mention as belonging only to final Unbelievers. The first obligation lyeth on the Elect themselves till they Believe: And moreover the New Law pronounceth them all that time, *non-liberatos*, unpardoned, and doth not give them any remission; though it pass not on them the peremptory irreversible Sentence.

Obj. *If this be so, then God should do the Elect themselves no wrong if he did damn them before they Believe.*

Answ. None at all; nor dare any sober knowing man tell God, that he had wronged him if he had so done: But on the contrary

its

it's the use of all Godly Orthodox men, Ministers or private persons (so far as ever I could observe) to confess to God in their Prayers, that he might justly have cut them off before their Regeneration, and have cast them into Hell; and that it was then their due; yea, that he might have sent them to Damnation from the Womb: yet it followeth not that God might Damn the Elect: For he hath Decreed the contrary: But the Purpose or Decree of God doth no more give them a Right to Pardon or Salvation, than my Purpose to make such a man my Heir, or to give him 100 *l.* doth give him right to that 100 *l.* or to my Inheritance. So that God Damns not any of his Elect: but the reason is not because that Damnation was not due to them before they believed, or because God could not damn them in Justice, or without wronging them; but because he cannot change his Purpose or Will; which properly is to say, God will not Damn the Elect, rather than, He cannot.

Obj. *But it would be a wrong to Christ: for they are given him to save effectually, by the Covenant between God and Him.*

Answ. I am indifferent how this is answered, seeing we are agreed in the sense, that God never will condemn his Elect: But by [the Covenant between the Father and Son] either they mean, somewhat from eternity, or before the Fall; and this is but Gods Decree; and is no more a Covenant indeed, than any other Decree

Decree of God is: Doth God make Covenants with himself?

2. Or else they mean the Prophecies and Promises in the Old Testament (or Scriptures before Christs Incarnation) made to or of Christ as God-man to be Incarnate: and these are more properly Predictions *de futuro*, as other Prophecies are, (which God cannot but fulfil because he is immutable and infallible) than the Divine Obligations, (which God must fulfil because he is Just:) or if any will say, that they are strictly obligations (about which I will not contend) yet the Elect are not named or individuals mentioned in them: Or suppose that the individuals names be implied, yet this is nothing to the time before such promises were made: Or if they had been made in the beginning, still this is nothing to the point in question. If God were obliged to Christ to save all the Elect, yet he was never obliged to them, till they believed; (I speak of Obligation in such an imperfect sense as it may be applied to God.) Much less did he ever oblige himself to save all that Christ died for.

2. And that Christs actual suffering gives no man right, appears from what was said on the former Proposition, If it was not man himself, that sinned who was the sufferer or satisfier, either *in sensu Naturali or Civili*. And therefore he cannot have the benefit till it be made over to him by some further conveyance.

3. And therefore it is no wrong to the sinner to suffer; because he suffereth but once, and suffereth no more than he deserved. So much against

against the first argument, as most forcibly managed.

The second Argument against Universal Satisfaction answered.

Arg. II. *Christ hath purchased Faith infallibly to be given to all that he died (or satisfied) for: But Christ hath not purchased Faith infallibly to be given to all men, but only to the Elect, Therefore Christ died not for all men, but only for the Elect.*

The *Major* is thus proved. Christ hath purchased all things necessary to the Salvation of all he died for: But Faith infallibly to be given, is necessary to their Salvation, *Ergo*, &c. The *Major* is thus proved, Christ is a perfect Saviour to all those to whom he is a Saviour or Redeemer: Therefore he hath purchased for them all things necessary to their Salvation.

The *Minor* of the main Argument is proved by experience.

Anf. The *Major* is not true, nor can be proved from Scripture; but the contrary may abundantly be proved. The argument by which they would prove the *Major*, is sick of the same disease; *viz.* Its *Major* is false: and the *Minor* if not well explained is false too. To the *Major* I say,

First, Christ hath done all that belonged to him as a Redeemer by dying, or as a Satisfier, or all that for which properly an expiatory Sacrifice

crifice was required, for all those for whom he died: But I shall anon shew that the thing in question is not such.

Secondly, Christ did not purchase all things necessary to Salvation, for all that he died for: I wait the proof of the affirmative. In the mean time I mind the arguers, that themselves confess,

1. He did not purchase Predestination.
2. Nor that Love which caused God to send Christ.
3. Nor Creation and our Natural Being.
4. Nor his own Death and Merits: He purchased not these for any man.

For the *Minor*, if it mean, [Personal Faith] which it saith is necessary to Salvation; It is not true of Infants: If it mean the same Faith, which now is necessary to our Justification (to believe that Jesus is the Christ, that he Died, Rose, Ascended, &c.) this was not necessary to the Salvation of all before Christs Incarnation.

As to the Argument by which they would prove the *Major*, I answer to it.

I. To the *Major*, by distinguishing [Christ is called a perfect Saviour] in several respects.

1. As to his plenary Power and Authority; so we confess he is a perfect Saviour.

2. As to the sufficiency of his Satisfaction, or expiatory Sacrifice, or of whatsoever he was to do as satisfier of Justice: and so I confess he is a perfect Saviour. And do not all the opposers confess that Christs Death was sufficient for All men? and all till a few of late do confess that Christ died for all men *quoad sufficien-*

tiam pretii: And if it be sufficient for all men, even for those that perish, then he is *quoad satisfactionis vel pretii sufficientiam* a perfect Saviour to all men: For they perish not through any Imperfection or Insufficiency in Christs Satisfaction or Sacrifice.

3. Or else it is in regard of the Application of his benefits, and conveyance of the fruits of his Death, that he is said to be [a perfect Saviour to all that he died for.]

And so 1. Distinguish still of the term [Saviour] as it signifieth [a satisfier of Justice, or *Redemptor per sacrificium expiatorium*] Christ is perfect *quoad opus*, as to his Work; and not only in himself and ability, and the material sufficiency of his Sacrifice: but, this is not to the present point.

2. A [a Saviour] signifieth, an actual Deliverer, by personal application and collation of his benefits; so again Christ is to be considered in a double Relation.

1. As *Dominus Absolutus ex novo Jure Redemptionis.*

2. *Ut Rector per leges ex eodem novo Jure*: As he is become the Absolute Owner or Proprietary of all: Or as he is become the Rector and so the Legislator, (for under one of these two respects he maketh over all his benefits.)

II. And accordingly you must distinguish of those benefits which Christ is to convey as *Rector per Leges*; and those which he is to convey as *Dominus Absolutus*, and as above or besides his Laws arbitrarily without pre-engagement. And so I answer, that Christ doth all that belongs to him as Legislator and Rector accordi-

according to the Tenour of the New Law and Covenant, perfectly to all, as well as to the Elect: But he doth not all that he may do, (and mans necessity requires that he should do) as absolute Proprietary or Owner; either to all, or equally to the Elect: yet is he not therefore an imperfect Saviour: For that belongs not to the making of him a perfect Saviour, though it belong to the perfection of the Sinners Salvation. And therefore the consequence of this Enthymeme is denied on these grounds.

That these things may be yet more clear, I shall briefly open a little further, the Nature of these distinctions, and the difference between these several effects of Christs Death; and so shew you that he is a perfect Saviour though he give not Faith to all that he died for; having shewed you in what sense Christ may be said to have purchased for us the Habit or Act of Faith. For I find that a good explication lets in more light into the understanding, and prepares it more for the entertainment of Truth, than doth the most subtle Argumentation.

And 1. You must understand that the first main distribution of the Works of Christ in our Redemption (comprizing the whole) is into the work which he did for the satisfying of Gods Justice, in offering himself a Sacrifice for sin.

2. And those which were to be done hereupon, for the sake of this: and that,

1. By God the Father.

2. To Christ, (accepting his sacrifice, acquitting him, making him Owner and Ruler.)

2. To us, Delivering us,

1. From our Legal necessity of Perishing.

2. To Christ as our Lord and Ruler, to be dealt with on terms that have a tendency to our recovery.

II. By Christ the Redeemer, who being thus made both Owner and Rector of us all, doth according to these two respects give out all the following Fruits of his death to Mankind.

So that Christ's first work of satisfaction which is terminated as it were on God, is a perfect entire work of it self. And (as Dr. *Ames.* saith in the place before cited, *Anti-Bellarm.*) it is to the work of Grace, as Creation is to the work of Nature.

And therefore as none can deny but the Non-Elect have common grace, as Conditional Pardon, Illumination, the Holy Ghost, *&c.* (else how do they turn grace into wantonness?) so none can well deny but they have it from the general Fountain of Redemption.

Let us then consider what is the proper use of satisfaction as such, and what it was that made satisfaction necessary.

And it is evident that it was the justice of God Creator, as Rector according to the Law of Works, and the misery of Man that had offended God by the breach of that Law, and was become liable to the Penalty, which he could not bear without his everlasting undoing. These made satisfaction necessary, as God's Justice required that either the Sinner must perish, or satisfaction by an Expiatory Sacrifice must be made, by which the remote and main ends of the violated Law might be as well attained

by the Sinners Damnation they would have been; so that it was the death which was become due to Mankind which required the death of Christ their Sacrifice, (as on Man's part;) and God's Justice which would not remit sin but on a valuable consideration for the demonstration of its self, and of God's Holiness. which required it on God's part; so that you see, that on our part, which required a Sacrifice was guilt, that is, obligation to everlasting punishment. And it doth not belong to the satisfier as such, to see that the guilt be actually done away *quoad eventum*, or that the Damnation be actually escaped: but that a sufficient Sacrifice or satisfaction be given, on consideration whereof Remission and Salvation may be given on the terms as the Legislators and Redeemers Wisdom shall appoint.

How Christ doth give out this Pardon we shall shew you anon, *de quadruplici Remissione*, so that it is apparent that the want of the act or habit of Faith, or the want of the Holy Ghost to effect Faith, is not the thing that required satisfaction to God's Justice directly; but that Faith is only a remote effect of this satisfaction, and such an effect as hath no such Natural Connection with this Cause, but that the Cause (materially) may be and oft is without that effect in many; and the effect might have been without that cause from another, if God had so pleased.

To manifest this (that it is not want of Faith that required satisfaction as such; and that satisfaction may be made for those that shall never believe) observe these things.

1. That Man's Suffering is not a thing pleasing to God in and for it self, but for its end, viz. The Demonstration of Justice and Right Governing of the World. God professeth that *he hath no pleasure in the death of a Sinner*, Ezek. 18. nor *in the death of him that dyeth*, Ezek. 33. *but rather that he repent and live*; Much less hath he pleasure in the death of the innocent, and least of all in the death of his own Son. God is not blood-thirsty, who abhorreth the blood-thirsty man.

2. It is not therefore for Christ's Sufferings as in themselves considered, that God doth give men either Faith or any Mercy. God doth not sell his mercies for blood, as if he would give the World Remission of Sins, on condition he might put his Son to so much torment.

And therefore Faith is not the immediate effect of Christ's death *in sensu morali*: It comes not from his death, as death or suffering; nor may it without Blasphemy be conceived that ever God made such an agreement with his Son, as to give Faith to Men meerly on Condition that Christ would suffer death without first considering somewhat else that required that suffering, and something that put a value upon it.

3. So that the thing which did require Christs Suffering, was (as is said before) the obligation to punishment, called guilt, on mans part, and vindictive justice on God's part. Unbelief as Unbelief did not necessarily require it, but the guilt of unbelief, or any other sin did require it, if ever it be pardonable.

4. So that the following effects of Christ's death do all presuppose the satisfaction of Justice,

stice, and hence Christs death becomes so pleasing to God, not as death, but as satisfaction, and so a means fitted to the attainment of his ends.

And because this means so pleaseth him, he esteemeth Christs satisfaction meritorious of further benefits, (joyned with his meritorious obedience) upon which estimation and his own will (called the Covenant with Christ) he annexeth further benefits thereto. For the end why he satisfied his justice by the Sacrifice of his Son, was that he might honourably, wisely, and justly give out the following benefits which he giveth out hereupon. So that Christs death is as to God, first satisfactory, and then meritorious of further benefits. Now Faith very remotely followeth all this, as shall be shewn.

5. The thing that God could not do without satisfaction, was the remitting of sin, and freeing the delinquent from punishment: it was not directly, nor in its self the bestowing of Faith.

6. For I would desire any Judicious Man to consider, whether if Christ had by his death satisfied God's justice for mans guilt, and had not at all done any more by his death for the meriting of Faith, might not God have given man Faith at his own pleasure, without the least shew of injustice, or any other prohibiting inconvenience? though Christ *de facto* did merit more, yet we may well in dispute for searching out the truth, separate in our thoughts guilt of sin, and want of Faith in Christ; and we may suppose that Christ had done no more by his death,

than to satisfie God's justice for man's guilt, by bearing that which was due to man.

Now I would fain know, this being once done, why God or the Redeemer might not give Faith to whom he will: Is there a further necessity of any new death or suffering to merit Faith for us? If there be, what is that necessity? It is no injustice in God to do it: There is no Law standing in the way by which he is obliged to the contrary.

Perhaps some will object, that the same may be said of Pardon and Salvation, that there needs no new suffering to merit them, if once Justice be satisfied, and yet Christ dyed for our Justification, and Salvation.

To which I answer, All this is true, but then observe the difference; separate in your thoughts Remission, Justification, and Salvation on one side, from Faith in Christ on the other side, (as we by supposition may well do in disputation;) and you will find that God could not give Remission, Justification, and Salvation from Punishment without Christ's satisfaction; but he could have given Faith in Christ (if you will suppose it to go alone without the former benefits) without satisfaction, I say, he *could* not give the former; not by reason of any impotency or imperfection in God, but by reason of the perfection of his Wisdom, Justice, and Holiness.

For them that deny this (as *Twisse*, and some others do, to the great hardning of *Socinians*, and Infidels) at present I refer them to the Writings of Divines that have proved it: As *Voetius in Thesibus, Camero Passim*; specially excellent

cellent well by *Mos. Amyraldus in Thesis. Salmuriens.* Vol. 1. *de satisfactione*: and *Essenius*, *Joh. Junius*, and most against the *Socinians* on that point, say somewhat to it, and something I have elsewhere said my self, and therefore will not now so far digress.

But on the other side, that God might have given Faith (separated from these benefits) without satisfaction, is evident.

1. In that there is no injustice or other prohibiting inconvenience in it.

2. God doth give the Devils a belief that God is, and that he is a Rewarder of them that seek him diligently, and that Christ is the Son of God, and the Saviour of the World, and that he was Incarnate, dyed for Sin, Rose and Ascended, and sitteth at the right hand of God, and shall come again to judge the World, some to life, and some to death, and that all the Scripture is Gods word, and all true, and that whosoever of Mankind believeth shall be saved, (for the Devil believeth the connection between Faith and Salvation.) all this Faith God giveth to those that look to the nature of things more than to bare words, and can see through the vail of metaphorical expressions, will not make any question of this; especially if they have so far studied the Civil Law and Politicks as is requisite for the right understanding of the nature and extent of these two relations. Indeed Christ is called a Father, but that signifieth but

1. His special propriety in us, as Fathers have in their Children (which is a branch of propriety in general.)

2. And

2. And his Authority over us, as a Father hath over his Children, which is part of his Rectorship. And withal it signifieth that special love of Christ to those to whom he is thus related.

So he is called a Husband, which expresseth the same special Propriety and Rectorship with the singular love accompanying them. He is called a Prophet, but that term expresseth but the manner of his applying himself to men in the exercise of his Dominion and Rule; for he that teacheth them, doth not teach them as a private man, but with Authority, and as their rightful King, whether they acknowledge him or no;) even as a King doth offer mercy to Rebels, and perswade them earnestly to accept it, shewing them the danger of standing out against him: Or as he teacheth his Subjects their duty; you may call this Man a Teacher, but the meaning only is this, he is a Teaching King, and so his Teaching is part of his Ruling, or subordinate to it: It signifieth but the manner of his applying himself to them. So Christ's Prophetical Office in its self belongeth to his Rectorship: Not that all Teaching is Ruling, but in all his Teaching he doth it as their Ruler, in right at least, if not in exercise. For that Teaching by which he converteth Sinners, is not properly an act of moral ruling those Sinners; but yet it is the Act of a King perswading Rebels to come in that they may be Ruled; and as their King doth he perswade them.

And then the diversity of the degrees of Gospel-Light and Motions, (some having more, some less, some none,) is from Christ as absolute

lute owner of all, that may do with his own as his list.

It were easie to manifest how all his other Office-Titles and Relations are reducible to these two, at least as he is signified in relation to the Creature; For in his intercession he stands in a double relation.

The one is to God, with whom he intercedeth, and so he intercedeth as the Son of his Love, who having satisfied his Justice, hath all delivered up to him, and therefore is Owner and Ruler of all.

The other Relation is to the Creature for whom he intercedeth; and that is as their Owner and Ruler, and for his own chosen as their Owner and Ruler in a stricter sense than the rest, even as they are his Jewels, and specially beloved.

More is said of this in another place: peruse the Table of the effects of Christ's death.

Now let us see how it is that Christ hath purchased Faith, and how he giveth it, having satisfied God's Justice by dying for all Mankind, God giveth up all men to him as their Owner and Ruler by Redemption-Title (and giveth up also into his hands the former obligation, as is said,) hereupon Christ hath full power,

1. To alter the Law, or to make new Laws for them, and by these Laws to confer Salvation, and other Benefits, by ordaining on what terms they shall be obtained, and so giving right to them.

2. To give further mercies over and above what he giveth right to by that Law, being absolute

Lord,

Lord, he may do with his own as he lists; (still supposing that his Fathers Will is his Will.)

Now Christ having received this Plenipotency, as *Rector per Legem*, he makes a free Universal Conveyance or Grant of Pardon, Justification, Reconciliation, Adoption, Sanctification, in the common Scripture sense) and Glorification to all Men on Condition they Repent, and Believe.

But he hath no where made any Conveyance of the first effectual Grace, or of Faith to any Man. He hath indeed propheſied or foretold us that he will infallibly give it to his Choſen, but he hath not named or deſcribed them by any antecedent diſtinguiſhing Character; ſo that no man can beforehand ſay this belongs to me, nor hath he by this Prediction made over to them any right to the thing, but only foretold that he will give them right hereafter.

Only he hath preſcribed certain means to all men, either for the immediate obtaining of Grace to believe, or at leaſt for the obtaining of Grace conducing thereto, which may bring them into a nearer capacity, who before were further off than the reſt of the World. And he hath given them ſufficient encouragement to uſe thoſe means without deſpairing of ſucceſs, even ſo much, as that no man that hath the uſe of Reaſon, can be named by the tongue of Man that did his beſt in the uſe of means to get Faith, or to get nearer to Chriſt, and yet loſt his labour.

Yet hath not Chriſt thought meet to engage or oblige himſelf to any Unbeliever to give him Faith; but when he doth it, he will do it as *Dominus*

minus Absolutus, and as not obliged; and indeed doth it only to those whom he had an absolute purpose to save, and were given him to be infallibly brought home to God.

So that Christ gives not Faith (the first Faith) as *Rector per Leges*, but as *Dominus Absolutus*. Those Mercies (if special) that are thus given, are said by some Divines to flow from Predestination alone, as did the gift of a Saviour to fallen Mankind; but no doubt, it is *mediante Sanguine Christi*, and in a remote sense are fruits of Christ's death.

By what hath been said it may appear that Faith is not the proper effect of satisfaction as satisfaction, nor is it any neer or inseparable effect of satisfaction as it is meritorious. God did not give Christ Faith for his bloodshed in exchange; the thing that God was to give the Son for his satisfaction, was Dominion and Rule of the Redeemed Creature, and power therein to use what means he saw fit for the bringing in of Souls to himself, even to send forth so much of his word and Spirit as he pleased; both the Father and Son resolving from Eternity to prevail infallibly with all the Elect. But never did Christ desire at his Fathers hands, that all whom he satisfied for, should be infallibly and irrisistibly brought to believe; nor did God ever grant or promise any such thing. Jesus Christ as a Ransom dyed for all, and as *Rector per Leges*, or Legislator he hath conveyed the Fruits of his death to all; that is, those Fruits which it appertained to him as Legislator to convey, which is right to what his New Law or Covenant doth promise. But those Mercies which he gives as

Dominus

Dominus Absolutus, arbitrarily besides or above his engagement, he neither gives nor ever intended to give to all that he dyed for; no nor to all his Elect doth he give all those fruits of his death, nor for ought I know to any in the same degree; for these are but remotely the Fruits of Christ's death, and not constant nor inseparable Fruits. Peruse the foresaid Table of the Fruits of Christs death, and it will shew you which the mercies be that Christ gives by Law, and which arbitrarily, as besides his engagement.

Is it not manifest then that it is a desperate charge against the Lord Christ to say, that he is an imperfect Saviour, if he do not perfectly save all that he Died for; or convey to them all the fruits of his Death?

The Preaching of the Gospel expressly, is a fruit of Christs Death: Some have this in great power, clearnets and constancy; some but weakly, darkly, or seldom; and some not at all. Shall they that have been at one or two dark Sermons of Christ in all their Lives say, That either Christ Died not for them, or else was an imperfect Saviour? Some are endowed with the gift of Prophecy, Tongues, Miracles, as fruits of Christs Death; shall all that receive not these say, that Christ is an imperfect Saviour, because he gave them none of these fruits of his Death? Some are made Kings and Rulers, and some Apostles, Evangelists, Pastors, Teachers, &c. and all are fruits of Christs Death: Yet all are not Apostles, Pastors, Teachers, &c: Some have Learning and some none: Some have good Parents, and good Education, and some bad: Some of the Elect have Health of Body,

and

and Helps, Opportunities and Advantages to to serve God, which others want: Some are permitted to live long in sin, as *Manasses*: And others converted in the morning of their Days: Some are preserved in a more even and comfortable walking with God: And some are permitted to fall into most hainous scandalous sins, to the great dishonour of God and their Profession, and to walk sadly for it all their Days, Nay, some to suffer Death by the hands of publick justice; Shall all these say, Christ is an imperfect Saviour to them? Some are kept in vigor and growth in grace, and some remain Infants; and some lose their first degree of Love, and grow more luke-warm, and Die in a very low ebb of Grace, Comfort and Assurance. Some enjoy much fellowship with the Father and Son in the Spirit: And others are almost wholly strangers to it. Some are made instruments of doing God abundance of service and the Church much good, and bringing home or building up many Souls, and that to the end of their Lives: Others are kept without parts and gifts, next to useless, if not burdensome. Some Distracted, and after a Godly Life fall into stark madness, and so spend their days as being uncapable of making use of their Affliction or of any Mercy: And some are cut off in Infancy or in the Womb, before they did ever believe or love God, or do him any service. And is Christ an imperfect Saviour to all these? Nay, and he hath revealed to us, that according to this diversity here in degrees of Grace, Holiness and Obedience; so will be the diversity in the degrees of glory: One shall be Ruler of ten

Cities, and another but of two: For he will reward every Man according to his works. How vast a difference then is there like to be between the Glory of an Infant, that being born of a weak believer, Died from the Womb, and the Glory of *Peter*, *John*, *Paul*, or those to whom it shall be given to sit on Christs Right Hand and Left Hand in his Kingdom. And yet all these are Elect. Where is it then that the force of the Argument lyeth that would prove that all must needs have Faith for whom Christ Died? If he be an imperfect Saviour except he save all alike, or give to all that he Died for, all the fruits of his Death, then such a charge might as truly be grounded on his dealings with the Elect themselves as with others.

Object. *But he saveth all the Elect, though not all alike: He bringeth them all safe to Heaven at last; but so he doth not others.*

Answ. That's true: But then,

1. It's yielded that it belongs not to the perfection of Christs Office or Work to give all the fruits of his Death (*quoad speciem*) to all that he Died for.

2. It belongs as truly to his office of saving, to save men from sin, and to give them a full degree of Grace and Glory, as to give men Faith: And yet it belongs not to his office necessarily to give these to all that he Died for. No doubt a greater measure of Glory is a greater good than that small measure which some enjoy. (Specially if the joy of some saved Infants were no greater than *Nazianzen* (*Orat.* 40.)

and

and other antients did think the pain of some condemned Infants would be.)

3. Some of these parts of Salvation which the Elect themselves do come short of, are penally denied them, (and so are given by Christ as Legislator) being propounded on a condition, and they not performing the condition; (to the performance whereof Grace was necessary to assist them.) If then Christ may give good things by a conditional grant (as Legislator) to his Elect, and yet not give them that Grace which may cause them infallibly to perform the condition, and so deny them the benefit conditionally given, for want of that performance, what reason can be given, why he may not do so by the Non-Elect, in respect of Salvation and Faith, and Repentance, the Conditions thereof?

So that all the weight of their Argument lyeth on this supposition, that Christ bore not Punishment for any mans sins but those whom he intended infallibly to bring to Heaven: which they have never yet proved, nor ever will do, there being no Word of God that promiseth to save all that Christ died for.

Lay all this together and you will see the truth of these Conclusions.

1. That it was not the absence of Faith in Christ the Remedy, but the Old Laws Obligation of us to Punishment, or the guilt of sin, which required Christ's satisfaction to God's Justice.

2. That Christ by this satisfaction did not immediately merit Faith it self, but only those intermediate causes, from whence the Faith of

his Elect is produced, that is, He purchased all men from the Legal necessity of perishing that they were in, into his own Power, as their Owner and Ruler, that so he might make over Reconciliation, Remission and Salvation to all, if they will believe; and might send forth sufficient means and help of Grace to draw all men towards him: resolving to draw his Elect Infallibly to him.

3. That it is therefore an improper and unfit phrase to say, that [Christ Died to purchase us Faith,] though rightly explained it hath truth in it; But rather, that [Faith is an effect or fruit of Christ's Death,] *viz.* where Faith is given. For the former phrase would intimate as if Faith were the thing that God was to give in requital of Christ for his Bloodshed, and that directly: and so Faith should be given by God as Legislator of the Old Law: For the stipulation supposed to be between the Father and Son, was made by the Father on his part, not as Redeemer, or Legislator of the New Law; but as the offended Rector according to the Law of Creation, now treating with the Mediator about mans Recovery. Though these things spoken after our manner, do but signifie Gods Decrees, yet they shew us in what Relation God stood towards Man and towards the Redeemer, when he required and accepted of Satisfaction. Whereas the thing given to Christ was Power of Dominion and Rectorship, and so the Redeemed delivered to him (not all to one final end, nor with a like intent.) And so Faith is procured by Christ only in this remote sense, in that he procured full power to use the

the fittest means to draw men to him, in the season and degrees he please; with a full resolution in his own mind to make all this effectual upon his chosen, that he might attain the full end of his Blood-shed. So that Faith is the effect of that degree of Grace which from his Plenipotency he gives, lest his chosen should miss of the intended Salvation; and therefore is improperly said to be purchased by Christs Blood, though yet it be a remote effect of his Blood to those that have it, and none could have had it without the Intervention of his Blood, because there would have been no saving use of Faith without that Blood: otherwise they might, if we look to Faith, but as such an act considered without its object given.

4. And therefore the Scripture no where useth any such phrase, as to say, that Christ Died to purchase us Faith: But ordinarily that he died to purge or put away sin, &c. And in controverted cases it is safest to speak in Scripture Language: Suppose a man pay 1000 *l.* to Ransom certain Prisoners that owed that sum, and upon the Ransom it is agreed that they shall now be delivered up to him, as his Ransomed ones, to dispose of at his pleasure; yet both parties agree that only those shall be actually delivered into freedom who thankfully accept the favour, and the Ransomer as their Lord: The Redeemer knows that these are men of such stubborn hearts that they will refuse his offer: yet he resolves to send them under his hand a conditional discharge, that all shall come forth that will accept him and his offer; and to tell them, that all the rest shall by him be

still detained, and as his Prisoners suffer greater misery: Yet out of a special love to some of them, he resolves to send a friend who is so effectual an Orator, as will certainly prevail with them to lay by their obstinacy and yield to his motion. Doth it seem a proper phrase in this case, to say, that this man paid 1000 l. to purchase for these men a yielding Heart, or to purchase their consent to accept him and his kindness? Rather he did it to purchase their Freedom from Prison; which he gives to all, as far as belongs to him as Ransomer. But he sends this Orator with a resolution to prevail, in another superadded relation, *viz.* as one that beareth a special love to those particular men above the rest; or as one at least that is resolved to attain infallibly that fruit of his Ransom, even the actual deliverance of those men. Nor can it therefore be concluded, that he paid not the debt of any of the rest, because he will not as importunately solicite them to accept of his offer.

5. We must therefore distinguish of meer Ransoming or Redemption by Sacrifice; and the same Sacrifice or Redemption as it is conjoyned with Election, and is subordinate to it: Effectual Grace to work Faith infallibly, proceeds from Redemption as it is accompanied with Election, or with a special absolute resolution, of saving those particular persons: but it comes not from mere Redemption by Sacrifice, as divided from Election; and therefore is common to all the Elect, but not common to all the Redeemed. For God hath means of two different sorts for the accomplishing his Decree

Decree of Election, as to execution: First general means, and secondly special means: and the general is the Foundation on which he means to build the special.

Let us again remember *Amesius*'s words, that Redemption is to the whole work of Grace (*viz.* both common and special) what Creation is to the work of Nature. Nay, better we may say, what Creation was to Gods Governing Administrations under the first Law, that is, Redemption to Gods Governing Administrations under the Second or New Law. For in Creation God did two things.

1. He gave man his Being, that he might be a Subject fit for Government.

2. He gave him his Right Being Real and Relative; making him after his Image, in his favour, and in a state of happiness: and in this state he made a Law with him, (even with all mankind in *Adam* and *Eve*,) promising him further everlasting life on condition of obedience. Now here Gods Creation of man in his favour and in rectitude, was a common work; and so was his giving him that Law: But so was not the fulfilling of its Promise, which implieth the Intervention of mans performance of the condition. Suppose now that man had been multiplied by propagation before the fall of any, and then one half of mankind had kept this Law of Works, and the other had broke it: Had it been fit for any man to say, that God did not Create any of those that fell, in his favour, or placed them not in happiness, or set them not in the way to a further happiness, because he did not infallibly cause them to keep his Law,

which was the condition of further happiness? No more can it be truly said that Christ did not Redeem them because he did not cause them infallibly to believe. Indeed it may be said of both, that God in Creating or in Redeeming had not the same Decree or Absolute Resolution to save them, as he had to save the Elect whom he causeth to perform the condition. And yet our Divines use commonly to say, that God created all Mankind in *Adam* in a state of happiness, and to a further happiness: that is, as Legislator, set them in a way to a further happiness, and conditionally promised it to them (whether it were any greater happiness, or only the perpetuation of the same, I will not now dispute.) And so hath Christ done all for men that pertains to a satisfier of Justice, and setteth them in a way to full deliverance from the misery that they were fallen into, and conditionally promiseth it to them, with an additional happiness.

6. And Lastly, Besides all this let it be well considered, that if there be any man on Earth (that hath the use of Reason, of whom only actual Faith is required) that doth not actually Believe in Christ, it is their own fault, and is not long of Christ: He will not condemn them meerly for their sin against that Law of works which saith [obey perfectly, or dye] but for rejecting recovering Grace, and that sufficient in its kind, and to its own work. I say it again confidently, all men that perish (who have the use of reason) do perish directly for rejecting sufficient Recovering Grace. By Grace I mean, mercy contrary to merit: by recovering, I

mean,

mean, such as tendeth in its own nature toward their Recovery, and leadeth or helpeth them thereto. By sufficient I mean, not sufficient directly to save them; (for such none of the Elect have till they are saved) nor yet sufficient to give them Faith, or cause them savingly to Believe: But it is sufficient to bring them nearer Christ than they are, though not to put them into immediate possession of Christ by Union with him, as Faith would do. It is an easie truth, that all men naturally are far from Christ, and 2. That some by custom in sinning, for want of informing, and restraining means, are much further from him than others (as the Heathens are.) 3. And that it is not Gods usual way, (nor to be expected) to bring these men to Christ at once by one act, or without any preparation, or first bringing them nearer to him. It is a similitude used by some that oppose what I now say: suppose a man in a lower room, and another in a room below him, and you stand at the Stair head, and call them both up to you, and offer them somewhat if they will come: It is not your intent that they should leap up at one leap, but come up step by step: nor do you mean that he in the lower room should go no more steps than he in the middle room: He must go many steps before he come to be as near you as the other is. Now suppose you offer to take them by the hand when they come to the upper Stairs, and give them some other sufficient help to come up the lower steps: If these men will not use the help given them to ascend the first steps (though intreated) who can be blamed but themselves if they come not to the

top? It is not your fault but theirs that they have not your hand to lift them up at the last step. So is our present case. Worldlings, and sensual ignorant sinners, have many steps to ascend before they come to Justifying Faith: and Heathens have many steps before they come as far as ungodly Christians (as might easily be manifested by enumeration of several necessary particulars.) Now if these will not use that sufficient help that Christ gives them to come the first or second or third step, who is it long of that they have not Faith?

Obj. *But here you vent two points of Arminianism, one, that there is sufficient Grace which is not effectual: The other, that God will give men Spiritual Blessings on the good use of natural.*

Answ. No Arminianism at all.

I. I say not that God giveth all men sufficient Grace to Salvation, or to Believe.

II. That there is such a thing *in rerum naturâ*, as sufficient Grace, not effectual, as it is confessed by Dr. *Twiss*, so it is undeniably proved.

1. In the case of *Adam*, who had sufficient Grace to have stood (or else all the sin and misery in the World must come principally from Gods denial of sufficient Grace, before ever man did trespass.) Yet the event shewed that that Grace was not effectual.

2. From the Case of the Godly, who have sufficient Grace to think, speak, and do more good, and less evil than they do.

3. From

3. From the Caſe of the Wicked, who have ſufficient Grace to enable them to do leſs evil than they do, and uſe more means for the geting of Grace to Salvation. They might paſs by an Ale-houſe Door, and might go to a Sermon when they go to a Whore: and might go among good company when they go to bad.

To the ſecond point I anſwer.

I. I ſay not that God gives Spirituals, on our right uſe of Naturals: but that God gives Special Grace, on our right uſe of Common Grace; Or rather that he may moſt juſtly deny men ſpecial Grace, that will not make that uſe of Common Grace as they might.

II. And I do not ſay, that God hath any where promiſed to give men Special Grace, if they will uſe well their Common Grace. For God hath not thought meet to make any ſuch Covenant with Unbelievers; nor to engage himſelf to them, but when he giveth the firſt Special Grace for Repenting and Believing he doth it as not pre-engaged to do it; and therefore as *Dominus Abſolutus*, and not *per legem premiantem*. (And therefore the Papiſts in their Language ſay, the firſt Grace is not of merit, at leaſt of Condignity.)

Obj. *Then they that come not the firſt ſtep are excuſable; for if they had come to the ſtep next Believing, they had no aſſurance that Chriſt would have given them Faith.*

Anſ. No ſuch matter: For though they had no aſſurance, they had both Gods Command to ſeek more Grace, and ſufficient encouragement

ment thereto: They had such as Mr. *Cotton* calls half promises, that is a discovery of a possibility, and high degree of probability of obtaining; as *Peter* to *Simon* [Pray if *perhaps* the thoughts of thy heart may be forgiven.]

They may think God will not appoint men vain means, and he hath appointed some means to all men to get more grace, and bring them nearer Christ than they are. Yea, no man can name that man since the World was made, that did his best in the use of these means, and lost his labour.

So that if all men have not Faith, it is their own fault; not only as Originally Sinners, but as rejecting sufficient Grace to have brought them nearer Christ than they were; for which it is that they justly perish (as is more fully opened in the Dispute of sufficient Grace.

I think now I may safely conclude, that there is no proof yet brought that Christ will give Faith to all that he dyed for, but the contrary I have proved.

Argument 3. *Against Universal Satisfaction.*

Christ dyed not for those who were in Hell at the time of his Death, therefore he dyed not for all.

Answ. I cannot discern any strong appearance of proof that can be brought for the Antecedent, however it take with very many, as I confess in the time of my ignorance it did with me.

1. If

1. Jesus Christ satisfied God's Justice.

1. Morally, at his first undertaking, interposing, or engagement (according to our apprehension) presently upon mans fall.

2. By that Natural Suffering which he had before undertaken, and this was in the fulness of time.

It is usual for moral effects to go before the natural part of the Cause, but the Cause is *in esse morali*, in moral being. Many a man upon his word to pay so much money such a day, or upon earnest given, hath the thing bought delivered to him, tho' he pay not the price till long after: So may a man redeem Slaves by such an undertaking. So did Christ undertake to bear the punishment due to the Sins of all; and this undertaking satisfied God, not without his Suffering, but by its respect to his future suffering, giving it a moral Being before hand; so that when Christs satisfaction was in its first moral being, no man (of this World) was in Heaven, or in Hell.

2. It was necessary, for Christ having undertaken to suffer the punishment due to their sins, before they were Condemned to perform his undertaking after they are Condemned.

If you give earnest for the buying of Beasts, or Slaves, and take them into your possession, and promise such a day to make payment, though they dye the while, you must pay the price.

3. Christ had as much of his ends obtained in those that perished by Rejecting Grace, before his death, as he hath for those that perish for the same cause since.

4. The

4. The Wicked that perished before Christ's death, had the same benefits by it, as those that perish after his death, (allowing the difference that the clear discovery of the mystery of Salvation now doth cause;) they had mercy offered them, and Remission and Salvation given them on Condition of repenting and believing, and sufficient grace to have brought them nearer God than they were, which if they had obeyed, they had a high probability of having more added.

5. All this presupposeth Christ then a sufficient Object for their Faith; that is, Christ who had satisfied for them, as to his Undertaking, and must and would do it afterwards in performance, was then the Object propounded for them to believe in; and therefore their Unbelief was Consequential, and not Antecedent to Christ's moral satisfaction, and suffering for them; even as the Faith of the Godly also was.

6. It is as good arguing, to say, some were in Heaven when Christ dyed, therefore he dyed not for them, as to say, some were in Hell, therefore he dyed not for them. For it may as wisely be said, those in Heaven were past all need of satisfaction, as that those in Hell were past all hope and remedy.

The time was, when they had hope from that satisfaction set before them, and when it was a sufficient remedy for them, and wanted nothing but their own consent to make it fully effectual: As the time was when those now in Heaven had need of it, and did accept it offered them.

Abraham

Abraham saw Christ's day and rejoyced, and *Moses* counted the reproaches of Christ greater Riches than the Treasures of *Egypt*: But the impenitent then refused Christ, and his Government, and therefore were justly denied his further Mercies.

7. Only this much may be concluded by this arguing; that Christ at the time of his dying, did not intend the Saving of those that were then in Hell; and so it is as true, that Christ at his death did not intend for the future to give Regeneration, the first Reconciliation, Pardon, Adoption, Union with him, or Glory to those in Heaven; for they had received them all long before, as the Damned had lost them all before by their Rejection.

But it follows not hence, that therefore Christ bore not the punishment of all mens sins, according to his first undertaking.

I know great dissimilitudes are pretended between the Cases of the Saved and the Damned when Christ dyed, as to this Argument, but they are but pretended, and none is shewed; and I think it needless to strive against meer words.

But a fore-mentioned Disputer undertaketh to shew, that the Answer drawn from the state of them that were Saved when Christ dyed, will not hold, and why?

1. He saith. [Those that were saved, were saved on this ground, that Christ should certainly suffer for them in due time, which suffering was as effectual in the purpose and promise as in the execution and accomplishment, &c.

Answ.

Answ. 1. And those that were Damned, had Pardon and Salvation given them freely, if they would have accepted them on God's terms; and this was on the same consideration, of Christ's future dying for them.

2. And consequently they who were then Damned for unbelief, were Damned for rejecting a Christ that had undertaken to dye for them, and the mercy purchased by his undertaken death.

2. This Author produceth such a Simile as I mentioned even now, [of one that undertaketh the ransom of Prisoners, and sendeth to them thereupon to come forth, for he that detaineth them taketh his word: Now if some come forth, and the rest refuse, and be dead in Prison, and others hear not of that, and that according to his appointment, and were dead long since; when the Ransomer comes to pay the Debt or Ransom, doth he intend it for them that dyed obstinately in Prison? or only for those that came forth? doubtless only for these last.]

Answ. 1. (To answer as confidently) doubtless it is the Debt and Ransom undertaken for all, and paid according to the undertaking.

2. Bring home the Similitude nearer the case, from payment of money, to suffering of the punishment which they should have suffered, or some other *ad fines Rectoris* equivalent, and doubtless then he suffered *Loco omnium*, instead even of those that are dead in Prison, or else he is not a man of his word, if his action answer not his undertaking: But he did not at his actual suffering intend it for the further good of the dead, not *in bonum ulterius omnium*, supposing what

what good they had before received by it, and might have received a full deliverance if they would; (And to make them willing and reasonable might belong to him in another respect to do if he pleased, but it did not belong to him either as Ransomer or Ruler of them.

Nor did he at the time of his payment intend to them that were before gone out of Prison at his command, any further good by his Ransom than what he gave to the obstinate that dyed, so be it they would accept it.

3. The said Author argued thus; (If Christ dyed instead of all men, and made satisfaction for their sins, then he did it for all their sins, or for some only. If for some only, who then can be saved, *&c*?

Answ. 1. He dyed for all the sins not excepted by himself in his conditional grant of pardon and life; [If thou believe and repent thou shalt be justified and saved.] That is, for all, except final impenitency, infidelity, or rejecting Christ.

And yet for all this, all true Believers shall be saved; For *he is become the Author of Eternal Salvation to all them that obey him*, Heb. 5. 9. *He is able to save to the utmost all that come to God by him*, Heb. 7. 25.] He dyed for temporary unbelief, that it may be done away by consequent Faith; but we may say more of this in a fitter place.

Argument 4. Against Universal Satisfaction.

4. If Christ dyed for those that shall be Damned, and never receive that Remission or Salvation,

tion, which he dyed to procure, then he suffered much in vain. (or cast away his blood) but the consequent is false, *Ergo*, &c.

Answ. 1. This is a strange Objection for those Men to make, who say that Christ suffered enough for all, or paid a Ransom sufficient for all, without any intent that it should be *loco omnium* in their stead, or should satisfie God's Justice for all.

They suppose Christ to have suffered or paid as much as we do affirm; we say it was because all mens sins lay upon him, they say no, and give us no reason why Christ should suffer enough for all, when he undertook to suffer only for the sins of the Elect.

I should think that the Objection lay stronger against them, that they feign Christ to suffer in vain; but how these same men can fairly object this to others, who assign so many effects of Universal Satisfaction, I cannot yet discern.

And let me add this much, lest I be mistaken in my tenth and eleventh Arguments against them (most of which is *ad homines*,) that I do not think it can be proved that the degree of Christ's pain was so punctually proportioned to the number of sins or sinners for whom he died, that if there had been one more sin or sinner he must have suffered more (or one 1000,) and if there had been one less, he must have suffered less; (though yet I think it was necessary that his suffering were so great and reproachful, as might be a full demonstration of Gods Justice, and

and might serve to the attainment of the ends of the Law: And not as the Fryars say, that the least drop of Christs blood might have served to redeem a thousand Worlds.) I suppose it is clear that Christ did give himself a ransom for Fallen Mankind in general, and that if it had been but for a few persons, less might have satisfied God's Justice than Christ did undergo: But that his *Sufferings* were so proportioned to the number of Sins or Persons undertaken for, let them prove that can, for I cannot, or that believe it, for I do not.

1. Because the principal Dignity of his sufferings which made them satisfactory, and equivalent to all mens sufferings, was not the degree of the pain, but the dignity of the sufferer; and next to that was the relative part, even the publick shame and infamy to which he condescended,

2. May we not think that as it was Christ as Man who suffered, so Christ as Man knew what he suffered for. And is it not doubtful whether Christ as Man in his suffering (before he was glorified) did know every Person, yea, or all the Elect for whom he dyed.

In his Infancy he did not; and when he saith, that the Son of man himself knew not the day or hour of his coming to Judgment, may it not intimate that he knew not just how long the World should last, and consequently that he knew not just how many, or who should be born (Elect or others) before the End: But this I will not insist on, as speaking with some fear of intruding too far into unrevealed things, and not doubting but that Christ as God knew

all men by name. But it is most unquestionable that Christ as man intended his Sacrifice in suffering to be in the stead and for the sins of Mankind in the general; whether he so intended it with a nomination of each particular Person or not.

2. I further Answer to this Objection, That it is high arrogance and presumption for us silly Bats and Moles to charge God with doing any thing in vain, or to charge Christ as suffering in vain, meerly because we cannot reach to the knowledge of his ends. As if he might not have many glorious ends that we know not of.

3. I further Answer, That it is most evidently discovered, that it is not in vain, nor one drop of Christs blood lost, tho' many that he dyed for do come short of Salvation. For that which is the means to these ends following (which Christ attaineth) is not in vain.

1. He hath attained the effectual satisfaction of Justice for all, *viz.* according to the First Law.

2. He hath delivered the Sinner from the legal necessity of perishing that he was then under.

3. He hath laid the Foundation of his new right of Dominion, as owner of all men: For to this end he both dyed, rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and the living, *Rom.* 14. 9. And if this were his end, and this end attained, then it was not in vain.

4. He hath laid the Foundation of his new right of Rectorship, as the forementioned Text more directly proveth; (for *verse* more respecteth him as Rector than as Owner,) God being

being minded to change the Government of the World, did lay the whole Foundation of the New Government in Christs Universal Redemption, even as he laid the Foundation of the Old Government, in the Creation of Man after his Image.

Our Divines say, God Created Man to Life and Happiness, so be it he would obey; and undoubtedly he Created him in a state of happiness, and put him in a way to obtain either the enjoyment of a greater, or at least the perpetuation of that which he did enjoy, and made him an implicite promise of it.

Now shall any man say, that because God foreknew or decreed that *Adam* would sin, and never obtain that life to which he was so Created, or which was so promised him, that therefore God made him capable of it in vain, or promised it in vain, or prescribed him means to the attainment of it in vain? (for his attaining Life after by Christ, is nothing against his losing it in the first way?) Most certainly those that see not the glory of Christs new Administration in the Government of the World in general, (in Title, and so legislation, judgment, and execution) as it differs from the Administration of the former Government, they do rob God of a very great part of the glory of the work of Redemption; and if they overlook so glorious an effect of this work (which should be part of the matter of their weekly solemn Praises on the Lords days in the Church Assemblies, for which the day was translated from the seventh, which was for the commemoration of the Creation, as the cause of our being, and ground of the former Government) no wonder

if they speak and write again Universal Redemption.

The whole World is now governed by Christ, and so by God, as he is God Redeemer. And it is no small flaw or errour in their Theology, that deny the Foundation of the whole Government, and then cry out, that we make Christ to dye in vain, if he bring not all infallibly to Heaven that he dyed for.

5. And also he hath (in subordination hereto) attained this by his death, that he hath power to abrogate or alter the Law that was against us: And that men before their believing, are now his Prisoners, and not the Fathers, as Rector according to the first Law unremedied, and so they are Prisoners of hope, and not of despair.

6. He giveth them under his hand a Conditional Remission and grant of Salvation: If they will have him, and Life with him they may, *For this is the Record* (which men perish for not believing) *that God hath given us Eternal Life, and this Life is in his Son: He that hath the Son hath Life, and he that hath not the Son* (for all that gift) *hath not Life*, 1 John 5. 10, 11, 12. This end Christ attained, and therefore dyed not in vain.

7. He putteth men in a way towards recovery, appointing them some means to be used thereto, and giving them sufficient grace or help to that use of those means which he first requireth of them.

8. These men do actually partake of a multitude of mercies in this Life, besides the forementioned: They enjoy a comfortable, healthful

ful Life, with the supply of their wants, being provided for with necessaries, and usually with delightful abundance; having the service and use of all the Creatures. They are kept from all cause of desparation, and the self-tormentings of Conscience which are its inseperable concommitants; and which those that feel do often call the torments of Hell within them. They are not only kept out of Hell it self, but (as is said) have a possibility of everlasting escaping it; and if they will not reject it, they shall certainly enjoy Eternal Life. All the mercies (in one word) which ever they receive are from the Blood of Christ; and therefore as to them, he Died not in vain. Their Lives indeed might have been continued according to the tenour of the first violated Law, but it would only have been as a fit subject of misery: It would not have been such a Life of Hope, Delights, and Abundant Mercies.

9. They shall all have their Bodies raised up at the Resurrection Day, and that by the power of Christ as the Redeemer.

10. They shall all be judged by Christ as their Lord-Redeemer, and so acknowledge him before all the World.

11. They shall be judged according to the Talents of Mercy which they abused, and the Grace which they rejected, after the tenour of the Redeemers Law; and not according to the unremedied Law of works: And so shall be left without all just excuse, even at the bar of Grace: To their greater shame, and the Redeemers greater glory, than if they had been judged according to the meer Law of works,

by God-Creator, as the Legislator of that Law.

12. Lastly, They shall in their just everlasting Damnation bring double Glory to Gods Justice, as Belilevers in their Salvation shall bring a double Glory to his Mercy. As in our Salvation God will not be honoured only as Creator and Rector according to the first Law; but also as Redeemer and Rector according to the New Law: So in the Damnation of Unbelievers, it is not only the Justice of God as Creator and Rector according to the first Law, but it is specially the supereminent Justice of Christ and God as Redeemer and Rector, according to the new Law, which will be everlastingly glorified on the rejectors of Grace. They will then fully acknowledge that Christ died for them and Redeemed them, and that in mercy; and that for the undervaluing and rejecting of that mercy, they do justly suffer: So that here will be a more glorious advantage for the demonstration of Gods Justice, than ever could have been according to the tenour of the first Law, and without Christs satisfaction for the Sinners. And I think if Christ attain his own and his Fathers Glory, he Dieth not in vain, and loseth not the fruits of his Blood-shed. He knows how to manage the business so as that he shall be no loser, let men prove as ungrateful and obstinate as they please. All these ends Christ actually obtains, for they are ends fully intended by himself. But then the very Salvation of all men, is *finis prescriptus & propositus*, propounded to man to be intended, and Christs satisfaction is made a sufficient means

means thereto, *in suo genere*, and so this may be called the end of Gods Legislative will, though he attain it not (as is said before.)

Argument the Fifth against Universal Satisfaction.

5. All those for whom Christ Died (or satisfied) have the Gospel Preached to them. But all men have not the Gospel Preached to them: Therefore Christ Died not for all men.

The *Major* is proved thus:

1. Christs Dying for men would be in vain, if it should never be revealed to them that they might believe: But Christ doth not Die for any in vain; *Ergo*, &c.

2. For whomsoever Christ Died, for them did he procure Remission, Salvation, and all means necessary thereto. But the Preaching of the Gospel is a means necessary thereto, *Ergo*, &c. Proved in that the Preaching of the Gospel is a necessary means to believing, and Faith is a necessary means of Remission and Salvation.

The *Minor* of the main Argument is proved by experience.

Answ. 1. Let it be observed that this Argument makes nothing against the Redemption of all men that hear the Gospel, Elect and Non-Elect; but only of those Pagans or others that never hear it; And if they grant that Christ satisfied for all that hear the Gospel, few will contend much with them about others; as judging

it

it partly so far beyond us, and partly so little to concern us, as not to be worth much contention. Yet, for my part, I think the Argument weak and the Conclusion untrue.

2. *Davenant* in his Dissertation of Universal Redemption, *Thes.* 4. *Cap.* 6. *per tot. page* 65. *ad. p.* 87 hath said so much to this point that I may well refer the Reader thither for satisfaction, without adding any more.

3. Yet I shall first briefly Answer the Argument, and then more fully open the truth about this point in certain conclusions.

And, 1. We must distinguish of several terms in the Arguments, and some other necessary to be here considered.

1. Christ is said to Die for men, 1. Dying *in their stead* and for their sin, as lying on him in the undertaken suffering:

2. Or else *finaliter in eorum bonum.* Which is,

1. Common.

2. Or Special. And both.

1. Either given as Legislator *quoad jus*, by a conditional grant.

2. Or given as *Dominus absolutus* and the disposer of all things *quoad eventus.*

Prop. When I say Christ Died for all men, I mean not that he finally intended as *Dominus absolutus*, eventually to save all by his Death: But that he Died in the stead of all, suffering the punishment which by the Law of works was due to all mankind: And how far he died *in bonum omnium*, for the good of all, is shewed before, and shall be shewed more anon.

Secondly

Secondly, We must distinguish betwixt the [the Gospel as it signifieth the Covenant of Grace with its grounds and fruits fully expressed] and as it signifieth [only some particular Gospel truths, which go before the full revelation of the said Covenant Grounds and Effects; as the Break of Day goeth before the Sun Rising: and the Revealing of some of the fruits of Christ's Death, by which streams, men should be drawn to enquire after the Fountain] in the later sense all have the Gospel; In the former, all have it not.

Thirdly, We must distinguish of [Preaching] which is either taken in general for any way of Revelation; or specially for a Revelation by Writing or Speaking. The former All have, the later not, (when I say [All men] I still mean [All that have the use of their senses and reason] and not Infants, Mad Men, Ideots, or Senseless, of whom more anon.) By this much you may see in what sense we acknowledge or deny the Truth both of *Major* and *Minor* proposition of the Argument. And hence also you may see how far I deny the *Major* of the next subservient Argument if withal you distinguish.

3. Between, *Frustra*, being in vain, absolutely as to all ends and uses, (yea Gods chiefest ends) or in vain to the particular end of the Sinners own Salvation.

4. And, (as to the cause hereof) you must distinguish between [being in vain through any defect of Christ's Satisfaction, or on his part] and [being in vain, (as to their Salvation) meerly through their own fault.] According

to

to the last members of these two distinctions we confess Christ's Death is in vain to all that perish, but not according to either of the former.

5. We distinguish between [Christs procuring Remission and Salvation to be made over to all by him as Legislator in the tenour of his Conditional Grant.] And [being eventually conferred on all by God as the disposer of events.]

6. We must distinguish between [the extent of the new Law or Grant of it, as to its own Tenour or Sense] and [the extent of it as to the Promulgation.]

7. Also between [promulgation initial, imperfect, and full and perfect.]

8. And between [means sufficient to the first Duties that Christ by Gospel Truths calls men to] and [all means absolutely necessary or sufficient to Faith and Salvation.] And so I answer to the second Prosyllogisme; that Christ did not procure that all he died for should eventually receive Remission and Salvation, or sufficient means thereto; nor yet that the Covenant of Grace which conferreth Right to these should be, as to the Infallible event, fully promulgate or revealed to all. But he hath procured, not only that all mens sins be made pardonable (in a nearer sense than they were before his satisfaction) but also that, as to the tenour of his Law, or Covenant, Remission, and Salvation be conferred on all so be it they will not reject it: and also that some part of his Gospel Truth (and the effects of Christs Death) be revealed in some measure to all, and so some part of

of his New Law promulgate to all; and all have ſufficient means to help to perform the Duties which he thus calls them firſt to perform.

9 We muſt diſtinguiſh between [Believing that God is, and that he is reconciled to man ſo far as that he will reward them that diligently ſeek him] and believing that Jeſus Chriſt was Incarnate and ſatisfied by his Death.]

10. And between [Neceſſary to Salvation *Neceſſitate Precepti*] and [*Neceſſitate Medii*] and ſo I anſwer to the laſt confirmation: that Faith in the firſt ſenſe is neceſſary to the Salvation of all that have the uſe of reaſon, both *neceſſitate precepti & medii*: but faith in the laſt ſenſe is neither neceſſary to Ideots, Mad-men, Infants, nor yet to thoſe that never heard the Goſpel, *neceſſitate precepti*: And whether or no it be neceſſary *neceſſitate medii, etſi non preſcripti*, we ſhall ſay more to anon.

So much directly to the Argument.

Next I ſhall for the fuller opening of my Judgment on this point, lay down what I conceive to be the truth in theſe following Propoſitions.

Propoſition I. As Chriſt hath born the ſins of all, and done all for them which pertaineth to the Ranſomer by an expiatory Sacrifice; and hath obtained thereby a new Title of Lordſhip and Soveraignty over all, and all are delivered to him accordingly; ſo doth he faithfully perform the office of a Soveraign Redeemer to all, governing them as his Ranſomed ones, by ſuch Laws and Ways of undeſerved Mercy, as have a natural tendency and conducibility to their Salvation. Though ſtill, as Abſolute Lord, he

he giveth out the Mercies which belong to him to beſtow in that Relation, with great diverſity, to all the World; but yet a great meaſure even of theſe doth he give to all men.

Prop. II. Chriſt dealeth not with any Heathens on the meer terms of the Law of works, as it was given to *Adam*, or ſtood without the connexion of any Remedy: Theſe are not the full terms on which God deals with them [If you perfectly obey (without any ſin) you ſhall live: If you ever ſin you ſhall dye.] This will be proved in that which follows: and might eaſily be proved more largely were it not ſo plain as to prohibit ſuch vain endeavours.

Prop. III. Chriſt is not properly ſaid to be in mutual Covenant with all that he died for; and I think he is not ſo in Covenant with any Unbeliever, as to a true mutual Covenanting, nor to any that never heard the Goſpel, as to the Legal promiſſory Covenant.

The Covenant of Chriſt is taken in ſeveral ſenſes: Among others for the two here mentioned.

1. For his New Law, Teſtament, Goſpel Promiſe, or Conditional Gift of Pardon and Life: (call it what you will.) By this he commands men to Repent and Believe, and giveth them his foreſaid Benefits on condition they perform this: laying a kind of engagement or obligation upon himſelf, which he cannot break; For *God cannot lye: and ſhall not the Judge of all the Earth do Righteouſly? How elſe ſhould God judge the World?* And God in the relation of a Righteous Judge *will give the Crown of Righteouſneſs at that day to all them that love his appearing.*

Now

Now I conceive that in a full proper sense, none that hear not the Gospel (*i. e.* that have not some Revelation of Christ Crucified) are in this Covenant, nor God in Covenant thus with them: For the Preceptive part of the New Law doth not actually oblige them to the performance of the full condition (of Believing in Jesus Christ Crucified;) nor doth the promisory part oblige Christ to give them the benefit in so full a sense as to those that have this Covenant revealed to them; nor can Christ be said conditionally to give it them, in so full a sense; because the Law or Deed of Gift is not Promulgate fully to them, as it is to others. I shall open this more in the following conclusions.

2. The Covenant of Christ is taken also for this same forementioned Covenant when it is accepted by Believing, and so become a Mutual Covenant, when men engage themselves to Christ as Christ first doth to them, and so the Promise comes into force for the actual conveying of Right to the thing promised. This is the fullest sense in which it is called a Covenant according to our common custom of speech: and the first is most properly called a Law, Testament, Disposition, *&c.* yet is the word [Covenant] in Scripture used oftest in this less proper sense. Now it is only Believers and their Seed that are in this mutual full Covenant with Christ. But this belongs not so nearly to our present enquiry, about the state of the Heathens as the former doth.

Prop. IV. The New Law, Testament, Promise or Gift, which saith, [Whosoever Repenteth

penteth and Believeth shall be saved; and whoever doth not shall be Damned] doth, as to its Tenour, or extent of the sense of the words, belong to all men in the World, even those that never heard the Gospel.

This is so ordinarily acknowledged, that I need not prove it: Nor doth it need any other proof than the recital of the Covenant-terms. The Promise is universal, and no man on Earth is excepted or excluded: so that Christ may be said to have, [1. Obliged All men to Believe. 2. And constituted Faith a condition of Salvation to all men. 3. And obliged himself to give them Remission and Salvation if they do Believe;] *quantum attinet ad merum Legislatorem*, as far as belongs to him as mere Legislator, or as to the meer enacting of his new Law, Grant, Testament, which is constituted and perfected with his *Fiat*: And of the three forementioned Acts, the last, which is the obligation on Christ's part, is most full and irreversible: For though there goes yet more to the actual obliging of the Subject to perform the condition, and of Christ to give the benefit, when the condition is performed; yet to the first conditional Obligation of Christ to give it, there is no more requisite to make it real and irreversible, than this enacting, so that the New Law or Covenant extendeth to all the World, as to its sense or tenour.

Prop. V. This New Law or Covenant doth not actually oblige men (for all the enacting of it) till it be Promulgate; that is, a rational sufficient publication of it, made to the World.

It

It belongeth to the Rector after the enacting of his Law, to promulgate it: And though promulgation be not in the strictest sense (I think) a part of Legislation (though many think otherwise I confess;) yet it is a necessarily subsequent act of the Rector, without which his Law cannot actually oblige; even as [Revelation] is a natural requisite, of our actual Believing any Truth of God; tho' not (as I think) the *ipsum formale objectum fidei, sed potius (quod dicitur) vinculum inter formale & materiale.* For it is the *Sense and Will* of the Legislator, that his enacted Law do oblige those, and only those to whom it is promulgate; (else it should be apparently unjust, as obliging to natural Impossibilities.) And it cannot oblige beyond his Sense and Will.

And therefore though the Tenour of the New Law extend to all men in the World, yet it cannot be said that any man is by it obliged to Believe in Jesus Christ Crucified, further than this Law hath been published or promulgate to him, with a Rational sufficiency. It is therefore a vain objection that one makes (*J. G.* against Mr. *Barlow*, p. 47.) that if men be not obliged before the revelation of the Gospel, then either they must remain disobliged when it is revealed, or else God must make a new Law for them, or be changeable: (that is his sense.) For it is sufficient that he make a Promulgation of that Law which before he had enacted; and which was before an Instrument fit to oblige but wanted the application by a Promulgation, without which it could not actually oblige.

By

By all this it appears, that if the Heathens may be said to be not-obliged to Believe, or to be not under the New Law or Covenant, it must be only for want of a sufficient Promulgation of that Law, and not for want of an Universal Tenour; or from any exceptions against them in the Law it self. Let us therefore next see how far the New Law is Promulgate to them.

Prop. VI. The Lord Jesus having enacted his New Law, did purposely ordain Universal Officers to Promulgate his Universal Law; giving them this Commission and Command, [*Go ye into all the World, Preach the Gospel to every Creature; He that Believeth and is Baptized shall be Saved, and he that Believeth not shall be Damned*]

So that Christ hath not been wanting *quoad actus morales*, as to the moral part, (which consisteth in commanding and authorizing his Officers) for the Universal Promulgation of his New Law. Yea, for my part, I doubt not but this work of publishing the Gospel to all Nations, and so carrying it to them that have not heard it, doth lye on some men to this day; and God would have such Universal Ministers yet in the World; and so far the Apostolical Work is not ceased: And I believe it is a most hainous sin of Christian Princes and States, that they procure not able Ministers to be sent into all the Heathenish parts of the World, as far as possibly they can: and that it is the sin of those Ministers, who have ability, fitness and opportunity for this Work, that they do not (how hazardous, and painful, and chargeable soever) set

set themselves resolvedly to it. So that if Christs Laws were well obeyed, there is no likelihood that there would be any known part of the World where the Gospel would not be published.

Prop. VII. So little know we of the History of those remote parts of the World, that have not now the Gospel among them, that it is very hard for any man to know that those Countries never had the Gospel in any measure revealed to them. We may discern that now they want it, and that they know not themselves that ever they had it: But how far their contempt of it may in many places cause God to give them up to that Barbarism and Sottishness as may obliterate all former Revelations, and bury them in oblivion; this we cannot tell, the rather because that the Apostles (and many other Christians) of that Age did travel so far in execution of their Office, and the *Gospel is then said to be Preached to all Nations, and the sound of it to have gone to the ends of the Earth, and through all the World:* and because there hath been so much entercourse between some Christians or other, and most of these Nations since then, yet is it most probable that there are many savage parts where the name of Christ was never revealed with a competent sufficiency, yea, or at all.

Prop. VIII. The Heathens that never heard the Name of Jesus, have yet sufficient means afforded them to know (among many others) these following Truths.

1. That there is a God, and only one God.
2. That this God is Infinite in Being, Immense and Eternal, and Infinite in Wisdom (Omni-

ſcient) Goodneſs and Power, (and ſo Omnipotent.

3. That he is the Maker, Preſerver, and Governour of all, and therefore that all men do by the ſtrongeſt obligations owe him the moſt perfect obedience.

4. That he being Ruler muſt needs give us a Law, that is, ſome ſign of his Will, conſtituting our duty, and determining what ſhall be our reward and puniſhment.

5. That God being perfectly Holy and Juſt, he muſt needs make a wide difference between the Righteous and the Wicked; and cauſe *Malum Paſſionis vel Phyſicum*, ordinarily to follow *Malum Morale vel Actionis, vel Omiſſionis: ut bene ruentem ſit bonis & male malis.* And that the ſame Cauſe which was for the enacting of his Penal Laws, requireth the execution of them ordinarily, at leaſt in as high a meaſure, as Worldly Princes are engaged to execute all their Laws.

6. That the Soul of Man ſhall in another World everlaſtingly partake of exceeding miſery or happineſs, according to what they have done in this World.

7. That therefore it ſhould be every mans chief care to provide for his Everlaſting Salvation, and to eſcape everlaſting Damnation or Miſery; and that all things in this World are vanity, and will not ſatisfie the Soul, or make men happy; and therefore that our care and labour for this World, and our Love of it ſhould be nothing in compariſon of our love to that to come, and of our care and labour for it, and that no man can be too diligent in ſeeking after his Everlaſting Happineſs.

8. That

8. That God is to be loved, honoured, obeyed, trusted, feared, and that above all Creatures whatsoever; and that he is the most happy man that is most in his favour; and that we should Worship him frequently, reverently, and heartily, and that according to his own will, and that we should honour our Superiors, and love our Equals also, and do no wrong to any man, in Soul, Body, Friends, Name, State, or Chastity; but do as we would be done by.

9. That all men are Sinners, and every man for himself may know by experience, not only that he hath broke these Laws, but often and heinously broke them, yea, breaketh them every day.

10. That a very grievous punishment is due to them for these sins.

11. That God being the Righteous Judge and Governour of the World, it beseemeth him to do Justice on those that so offend him, and to adjudge them to their deserved misery, except on some valuable Consideration he forgive them.

12. That it is past their reach to discover of themselves what such a valuable Consideration may be, or what God will accept of as sufficient to be a ground for Remission of this Sin and Punishment.

13. That it is past their own power to make any satisfaction, seeing all that they can do which is good, is but the remainder of their duty, (which yet is depraved by the daily mixture of Sin,) and all that they can suffer here, is but part of their desert.

All this the light of Nature may shew them, as is evident by the clear deductions and inferences of Reason, and all this is Antecedent to any thing Evangelical.

But besides all this, God's Providential dealings may teach them some things of another Nature, even concerning God's mercy, and their own Recovery. As particularly.

1. That God doth not deal with Mankind in general, or themselves in particular according to their desert. This they may find by his patience, and the multitude of mercies that they enjoy.

2. Nay, that he dealeth with them so much contrary to their desert, as to give them abundance of precious mercies through all their lives, when they had deserved the greatest misery.

3. That therefore God hath found out some sufficient means, grounds or terms on which he both may and doth actually dispense with the rigour of exact Justice.

4. That therefore their case is not utterly desperate, and remediless.

5. That they cannot of themselves discover what those satisfactory grounds are, on which God so suspendeth the rigour of Justice, and dealeth with them so contrary to their deserving.

6. That therefore they should use all possible means and industry for the fuller knowing of these great things, and therefore send to enquire of all others in the World, as far as is possible, who are likely to know more of them than they.

7. That

7. That they should for the time to come repent unfeignedly of all their sins, not only as they are hurtful to themselves, but as against the publick Ruler of the World to whom they were so many ways obliged; and that for the time to come they should to the utmost of their power sin no more.

8. That they ought frequently and fervently to pray to God, both to reveal to them fully their Case, and his Will concerning their Recovery and Duty, and importunately day by day to beg mercy at his hands.

9. That all this must not be done in desperation, but as a means to their own deliverance, and God is to be sought and worshiped by them as a merciful God, as having proved him so to be, and that the use of his means is not like to be in vain.

10. That in careful seeking, and diligent obedience they should continue to the death, against all Temptations to the contrary.

All these Truths may those come to know, by the use of Reason, from the Creatures, and Providences, and specially their own experiences, who never heard of Christ or Scripture. And how much *Socrates*, *Aristotle*, *Plato*, *Plotinus*, *Seneca*, *Cicero*, *Plutarch*, &c. did know, may partly be seen in the Monuments of their Knowledge.

Prop. IX. All this Revelation is some part of the Law of Jesus Christ, and so these Truths are discovered, and this light sent by him as the Lord Redeemer of the World, or as Rector upon his Redemption Title. For all things being now delivered into his hands, and the whole

frame of Government being laid on his shoulders, and built on his Redemption, even on Christ the head Corner Stone; the very moral Law now is his Law, and its obligation to obedience is his obligation; yea, the very Law of Works obligeth to punishment now, not as it was at first given, and remaineth in the hands of an offended unsatisfied Creator, but as it is suspended and delivered up into the hands of the Satisfier or Redeemer, to remit wholly, or execute only, conditionally, as men shall receive or reject the grace of Redemption; so that as God ruleth among those blindest of Heathens that yet know him not, so doth Christ Rule among them that know not him.

Prop. X. The Ten last Particulars before mentioned, which these men may know, are properly Gospel Truths, for the Law of Works sheweth nothing of Mercy contrary to desert, nor of any hope of Recovery.

Object. *But how can the meer light of Nature discern Gospel Truths, without a supernatural Revelation?*

Answ. The Light of Nature is either Reason it self, which is the Souls visive faculty.

2. Or the External Light which in the nature of things shines forth.

3. Or the Species and Knowledge received by Reason through the mediation of this External Light. Also supernatural Revelation is,

1. Either the Rectitude of the Soul as a Recipient Power or Faculty, which was natural to *Adam*,

Adam, and may be called supernatural to us, because it is not born with us, and because it is not wrought but by a supernatural efficient, though it be most natural to us, as a thing congruous to our Natures welfare, as health is to our Bodies.

2. Or it is the Objective Extrinsical Revelation by a supernatural way, and that either as distinct from that which should have been according to the Tenor of the first Law, or from that which is ordinary by common Causes, tho' beyond the former.

3. Lastly, it is taken for the actual efficient impressing of the Species on the Intellect by a supernatural Assisting Power.

On these distinctions I Answer.

1. Natural Reason, or the Intellectual faculty is the recipient of all Revelations, natural, or supernatural.

2. There are many Objective Revelations supernatural, as being such as according to the first Law of Nature would never have been manifested, which yet are not supernatural as Miracles are in opposition to a natural Causality in the way of Revealing. And so Rain, and Fruitful Seasons, Health, Wealth, Deliverances, *&c.* are Mercies that come in a natural way of Causality, and yet they may teach a Sinner those Truths which the meer Law of Nature never taught him; Mercies and such Mercies given to those that deserve Misery, and are obliged to extremity of Punishment by Law, do teach us that there is Remission of Sin, and a way found out for the Relaxing the obligation that mens deserts do not fall upon them. These

Providences therefore are so far supernatural, as being the clear effects of the Law of Grace, which relaxeth the obligation of the Law of Nature.

Prop. XI. It is not proper or fit to say, that [the Gospel is Preached to these Heathens that never heard of Christ,] because that the word [Gospel] most properly signifieth the main heart and substance of it: *viz.* The discovery of Christs Incarnation, Life, Death, Resurrection, Ascention, Dignity, Office, and the full New Covenant. But yet it may truly be said, that some Gospel Truths, and so some small part of the Gospel is revealed to these men; *viz.* the ten particulars forementioned. No doubt *Paul* Preached part of the Gospel to the Heathens at *Lystra*, *Acts* 14. 7, 15. &c. when he mentioned Jesus Christ, *ver.* 23. *Heb.* 4. 2, 3. It is said that the Gospel was Preached to the *Jews* in the Wilderness, who yet had little of that which now is the substance of our Creed about Christ.

Prop. XII. That Repentance which God requirerh now of all men (even them that never heard the Gospel) is not a Hellish, *Judas*-like despairing Repentance; (such as was due according to the violated Law of works:) but it is a Repentance that is appointed as means toward recovery, and therefore hath a tendency to Salvation. Gods mercies lead to Repentance, but not to a despairing Repentance; for they contradict that. All the precepts of Repentance prove this, and the course of Gods dealings. And indeed, else all the remnants of Religion would be banished out of the World. For despairing men will not Worship God, nor seek to please him, nor forbear sinning; but

but will hate God and live like Devils, and sin while they may, without voluntary restraint. All the Sacrifices that the Heathens offered, and all their Prayers and Conscience of Sinning shewed that they apprehended God merciful and placable, and their case remediable. Hope did keep up all that remnant of Religion which all Nations of the World have maintained, which else had been extinguished long ago, and Earth been like Hell.

Prop. XIII. These Heathens do all of them receive some Grace which was purchased by the Blood of Christ, and there is a Natural aptitude in it as in other effects, to lead the enquirer to the knowledge of the cause and fountain, *cæteris concurrentibus*; Grace is Mercy contrary to Merit. Heathens have much Mercy contrary to Merit, therefore they have some Grace.

Now all such Grace is inseparable from some Revelation of Gospel Truths: Nay, indeed it is a Revelation there of it self.

Prop. XIV. Though Christ giveth not to these Heathens sufficient Grace to believe in his name, yet he giveth them sufficient Grace, or merciful aid to receive and obey those (or some of those) Truths fore-mentioned which he doth reveal to them, and so to come nearer to Christ than before they were. I have before shewed, that all men are far from Christ Naturally, and that they must be brought divers steps or degrees nearer him, before they are brought to the very act of Faith which unites men to him; specially Heathens that are at the remotest distance. Also I have shewed that there is such a thing as sufficient Grace, not effectu-

effectual as to the event; and that both from the example, of *Adam*, of the wicked now, and for the Godly themselves. I shall therefore now suppose what is already proved. I have shewed also, that though God thought it not meet to engage himself in Covenant with such, nor to make any thing short of true Faith, to be the condition of his Promise, yet he hath appointed means to others that yet have not Faith, which they are bound to use towards the getting of it; and he hath given them sufficient encouragement to address themselves cheerfully and vigorously to the use of those means, with hope to speed. So that if they neglect them they are left without excuse.

Prop. XV. It belongeth to Christ in drawing men towards Salvation by his Rectorship, to reveal oft times some of the forementioned Gospel Truths by way of preparation, and to draw men nearer him, before he reveal the full substance of his Covenant, or fully promulgate his Law. As the Sun sendeth forth some light before it appeareth it self at its rising, which light yet comes from the same Sun: So doth the Gospel oft-times.

Prop. XVI. Those that have the forementioned truths revealed to them with hearing the Gospel, are bound in all reason for the safety of their Souls, to use all possible diligence to make a fuller discovery; which is not likely that any Indians or others have done: Had they been as diligent in improving the truth received till they had been civilized, and then in sending to all others for information where there was a probability of receiving information even

as

as men are diligent in trading tedious Voyages for Merchandize and Worldly Gain, it's like there is no Nation under Heaven but might have had the Gospel ere now.

Prop. XVII. If men will wilfully reject and abuse that measure of light and help which they do injoy, which was sufficient to that end whereto it was given. (to have brought them nearer Christ than they were:) And if they will not use the means for getting of the Gospel, which they have sufficient help to use; then it is apparently just with Christ; even as Rector according to the Law of Grace, to condemn such men after he hath Died for them. And if his Death prove in vain, as to their Salvation, the fault is only in themselves. and themselves, shall they blame for ever. And this is the case of these men.

Prop. XVIII. Nay in this case the very Law of Grace, commanding Faith in Christ Crucified doth oblige these men remotely to the Duty, and to punishment for neglect of the Duty. For though a Law not promulgate cannot oblige, yet the Question is, Who it was long of? Or, Who was the faulty cause that it was not Published? If the Law-giver, then it cannot oblige: But if it were the subject, then it doth actually, though remotely oblige. For no man is to receive benefit (saith the Civil Law) by his own fault. Who knows not that among us if a Man will lie in an Ale-House and never come to hear the word, God will judge him guilty of being Ignorant of all the Truths which he might have there learnt? And of neglecting all the Duties which he might have been informed of? And if a man know

know some few preparatory Truths here, (as that he is a sinner, and miserable, and ought to seek out for remedy, and should come to hear the word, and forsake his known sin, and keep good company, &c.) and yet he despise or disobey these, shall we say this Man was never bound to believe? I say, he is bound [remotely] that is, first to do some other Duties which tend towards the obtaining of the Gospel; and then to believe: For the obligation to both Duties lyeth on him at once; but not an obligation to perform both Duties at once.

Object. *But if they should improve their degree of Light and sufficient Grace, they have no certainty by (because no promise) that the Gospel shall be given them.*

Answ. That's no excuse as long as they have so full encouragement, as is before expressed. Should a man in danger of Death do nothing for his own safety without a certainty of success? Should not the least hope of probability (much more so high a probability) be enough to excite men to seek the saving of their own lives? Suppose a King having past an Act of Oblivion (upon a ransom to that end) for a whole Nation of Traytors (as *Ireland*,) should send his Herald to proclaim it to all: But to some of them he sendeth before hand some inferior messenger, telling them in the Kings Name, that he is placable, and their case remediable, and he requires them to use certain means (as Submission, Petition, Laying down Arms, &c.) and

try

try what the King will do? If these men reject unthankfully this favour, and abuse the messenger, and persist in Rebellion, is it not just with the King to forbid the Herald, that he proclaim not to them the act of oblivion? And is it not long of themselves if they never hear it, nor have any benefit by it? so is it in the present case. By the abuse of sufficient Grace to have come nearer Christ, do the Pagans forfeit all other fruits of his blood. So that Christ may truly be said to have done his part even as Legislator; and to have promulgated his new Law among them, in that he did his part, and so it's promulgate *moraliter vel Reputativè*, though it was not *actualiter & perfectè* through their own fault. It is not long of Christ but of themselves that it was not done fully, in that they ungratefully rejected his Precursors or Harbingers that came before the Gospel. Seeing they would not make use of the Twilight or Day-break, Christ justly denieth them the Sun-Rising.

Prop. XIX. It seems most probable that it was not only *Adams* first sin that is imputable to his Posterity, but that we are all still guilty of all our Parents sin to this Day; and that therefore God may justly deprive a whole Nation of the light of the Gospel for their Progenitors sins, and that not only according to the Law of Works, but even according to the Law of Grace.

I will not stand now on the proof of this, any further than to tell you;

1. That the same solid Arguments which prove the imputableness of *Adams* sin, seem to me

me to prove this; and by denying this we overthrow the grounds of the Doctrine of the said Imputation.

2. And that the Second Commandment, with all those Examples of Gods destroying the Children with the Parents, and for their sin, do seem fully to prove it; together with the practice of Godly men to humble themselves for their Fathers Sins. Yet understand me thus, that though according to the Law of Works we are guilty of all our Parents Sins; yet the Law of Grace Promiseth that no man shall be destroyed for them, who disowneth them by true Repentance and taking a contrary course (in obedience) when he comes to Age. (This is the sense of *Ezek.* 33. and 18.) And so the guilt is cut off, and the Child by the Covenant of Grace taken in with its Parents, and so is looked on as in his immediate Parents, and the sin of former Parents forgiven him; though yet that guilt will return if when he comes to Age he ungratefully reject the mercy by renouncing the Covenant of Grace.

I do but propound this to Divines to consider: For certainly if we prove all guilty of all our Parents Sins; it is said that the Church hath no better understood it, and that we have none almost that ever bewailed, acknowledged, or pray'd for Remission of such a Guilt; nor any Ministers that ever acquainted them with it (yet *Ursine* and some few I find make it doubtful) yet here is no ground for their objection, who say, that then for the Sin of *Cain* or *Cham*, God may destroy all their present Posterity.

To

To which I Answer.

1. According to the Law of Works, he may.

2. According to the Law of Grace, if there have been no Godly intermediate Progenitors. (which is false or improbable.)

3. Or if the Children prove wicked and rebellious themselves, God may bring on that Generation the Evils deserved by the foregoing. Yet is there a great difference in degree between guilt from Progenitors, and guilt from our own Personal voluntary Actions; and therefore God never imputeth the former where men are personally obedient and penitent; but lays it as an addition to their personal guilt, on the Impenitent and Disobedient.

Prop. XX. I cannot find in Scripture where it is clearly revealed to us, on what terms God will Judge those that heard not of Christ. In general we find that he will judge them according to their usage of the Talents of Mercy received, and not according to the rigour of the Law of works as it stands alone; but particularly how God will proceed with them, or whether any Heathen be ever saved? I cannot find that he hath revealed. For indeed it doth not concern us to know it. I dare not say that any of them (*Socrates*, *Seneca*, *Plato*, &c.) are saved: Nor dare I say that I am certain they are not: They that are certain let them be thankful for their knowledge, and not be angry with me for confessing my Ignorance. And I hope they will distinguish between Ignorance and Error, and therefore not charge me with Error in this. It seems to me that these

men

men being not under any conditional Promise of Life, (for Faith is the condition) therefore they cannot lay claim to Salvation by the Tenour of the Covenant. (Though some think that the Promise of Pardon and Life to them that Repent may give them an interest:) But yet God is not engaged to the contrary, but dealeth Arbitrarily with them, and therefore we cannot know his dealings particularly and fully herein.

Prop. XXI. Those Scriptures that speak of the necessity of Christ to mans Salvation (for satisfying Justice) do plainly extend it to all men in the World, but those that speak of the necessity of believing seem to limit it to them that hear the Gospel, or might have heard it but for their own fault. It is true of all men, that there is no other name given under Heaven by which they can be saved, but the Name of Jesus: There is no Remission but by his Blood, nor Acceptance with God but for the sake of his Satisfaction and Merits. But it may be observed from the Context, that when it is said [He that believeth not shall be Damned] it is plainly fore-implyed, that they are such as are called to believe. It hath the Nature of a threatning and therefore presupposeth the sin of Unbelief, and that it be not meer Negative Unbelief, but Privative; and that supposeth the duty of believing, and that supposeth the command constituting the Duty, and that supposeth Natural Power in Man, (though not Moral) and the Natural possibility of obeying. Peruse each particular Text of this Nature and you will find this true.

Prop.

Prop. XXII. Personal Believing was never commanded to Infants or Ideots, nor required as necessary to their Salvation.

Prop. XXIII. The same Faith which is now among us of absolute necessity to our Justification and Salvation, was not so to those before Christ; therefore it is not *per se* of absolute necessity to Justification by Christ: Therefore if God so please, those that hear not the Gospel may be Justified without that Faith which to us is necessary. *If we believe not that Jesus is the Christ we shall Die in our sins.* But this was not necessary to the *Jews* before Christs coming: Nay, it appears by divers passages in the Gospel, that Christs own Twelve Apostles after they had long heard his Teaching, and seen his Miracles, did not believe that Christ should be put to Death, and be made a Sacrifice for Sin; much less his Resurrection, *&c.* And how unlikely is it then that all the true believers of the World long before should believe this? (However some Prophets might discern much of it.) Do but well peruse every example of believing in, *Heb.* 11. and see what Faith it was that then saved them. Yet to think that the same would save us now, were a desperate mistake.

Prop. XXIV. God can if he please pardon and save men for the sake of Christs satisfaction, without letting them once know that Christ satisfied for them, else he cannot save an Infant or an Ideot. Some Divines (as *Twisse, &c.*) are so bold as to say, that God could have pardoned Sin without Christs satisfaction:

faction: I dare not say so: But methinks the same men should never make mans knowledge or belief of Christs satisfaction, to be absolutely necessary to Salvation, if the satisfaction it self be not: Dare any say, [My own Faith was more necessary than Christs Death? I could have been saved without Christ, but not without Faith.] God could have forgiven men absolutely if he would, or else have made some other condition, when once his Justice was satisfied: And therefore we cannot conclude that this is the condition to any further than Scripture saith so.

Prop. XXV. Yet is Repentance, Belief in God, Love to him, and sincere Obedience, of Natural necessity. For God cannot be enjoyed in Glory but by these Graces; nor as a Just Rector can he save them that love him not, and that Rebel against him.

Prop. XXVI. Those who think it possible for a *Socrates*, *Seneca*, &c. to be saved, (or one that never heard the Gospel) do not hereby equal Heathenism with Christianity, nor make our Religion needless: For they,

1. Make their Salvation less certain, and ours most certain.

2. And their Salvation most difficult (as for a man to hit a narrow way in the dark;) and ours incomparably more easie (as for a man to hit the right way by day-light.)

3. And that therefore they are very few of them that are Saved; but Multitudes with us.

4. That their Glory shall be lesser (as his that improved the two Talents;) and ours greater,

greater, (as his that improved the ten:) Besides many more differences.

Prop. XXVII. If all the Heathen be Damned, though their loss will be materially equal with ours, yet formally as a privation (for they were never in our capacity of Glory;) and their *pœna sensus*, will not be near equal to ours either materially or formally. For their Consciences will never torment them for the refusal of Christ revealed, and Heaven offered to them, or any other sins which they were not capable of committing. Nay, if it were true that some teach, that they had no Gospel Mercy or Grace given or offered to them, nor any satisfaction ever made for them by Christ, then should they escape all the forer punishment of the new Law, and never suffer at all for Abuse of that mercy, or rejecting a Redeemer, or any fruit of his satisfaction which he made for them. And this would be an easie Hell in comparison of theirs that refuse Christ offered them.

Prop. XXVIII. We must in all our Controversies try the *Minus nota pro notiora & minus certa per certiora, & non contra:* We must reduce uncertainties to certainties, and dark points, to clear ones; and not certainties to uncertainties. Seeing therefore it hath pleased God to leave his final dealing with Pagans (that hear not the Gospel,) Ideots and Infants, so uncertain and dark, the Controversy of Universal Redemption is not to be tryed hereby, nor all the plain Scripture for it, to be reduced to the uncertainties herein.

So much to this Argument.

Let the Reader note, that since the writing of this, I am clearer than I was then in the assurance of this Truth, that the Covenant or Law of Grace, as it is the Rule of Duty and Retribution; was made with all Mankind in the first Edition, in *Adam* and *Noah*; and is not repealed to any that have not the second Edition (in the Gospel) but the rest of the World are still under it.

When I had gone thus far, *Dallæus*'s Defence of Universal Redemption, and Grace came out with *Blondels* Preface, where are so great a number of Witnesses cited of all Ages, that I not only stopt my work, but cast away a multitude of Testimonies which I had collected, even of English *Anti-Arminians*; such as *Davenant*, *Ward*, *Hall*, *Carlton*, *Rob. Abbots* Bishop of *Salisbury*, Dr. *Preston*, *Whately*, *Will. Fenner*, *Ezek. Culverwel*, and many such.

DISPUTATION

DISPUTATION

OF

Special Redemption;

Whether Christ Died with a Special Intention of bringing Infallibly, Immutably, and Insuperably certain Chosen Persons to Saving Faith, Justification, and Salvation?

THE Question is so cautelously and clearly expressed, that I need not say much for the explication of it, but shall directly determine it *Affirmatively*, only in brief take notice of these things, as the Reasons of the Terms.

First, We mean here the *Intention* of *Christ* [*as God*;] for so he *knew all things*, and *Willed* all the Good which he knew. But whether as Man, he that knew not the day nor hour of his own coming to Judgment did know the number and names of his own Elect that ever were and should be, and consequently, whether he had a special Intention concerning the Salvation of each of them in particular; this I shall purposely leave undetermined.

Secondly, It is therefore implied by us, that

the *Father* and *Holy Ghoſt* had the ſame Intention which we affirm Chriſt to have had.

Thirdly, By the word [*Intention*] we mean that Act of Chriſt's Will, which is reſembled by *Intention* in mere man, and ſo is *Analogically* called *Intention*. And we confine it not to the *Will alone*, but take it as comprehending that *Counſel* of the *Underſtanding*, or that *ſimple Knowledge*, which the act of the *Will* ſuppoſeth: Nor do we take it in the *ſtrict* ſenſe, as it is terminated only on the *End*, and ſo *Intentio Finis* is diſtinct from *Election* of the *means*: but more largely as it may comprehend either of theſe, for that which we commonly call a *Purpoſe* or *Reſolution*.

Fourthly, We call it [*a Special* Intention; becauſe it is about a *Special Object*, and is not *General* or *Common* to all.

Fifthly, We call it an Intention of [*Bringing*] men to Faith, *&c.* becauſe it is Chriſt's *own Work* to *give* theſe things which he *Intendeth*, and ſo we difference it, both from his *Intention* to *Permit* (if ſuch there be) in caſe of *Sin*; and from that imagined Intention of a Partial Cauſation, & of a Concurſe determinable by the Will of Man. But tho' it be an intention of *Effecting*, that we mention, yet the *Manner* of this *effecting*, or bringing men to Believe, we here meddle not with.

Sixthly, It is an [*Infallible*] effecting of this that we mention, thereby differencing it from a mere *Velleity*, or a *conditional willing*, ſo as that the very act of willing, ſhould depend upon ſome uncertain condition: as diſtinct from this we may call it *Abſolute*. And in the word [*Infallible*,]

fallible] which respecteth the act of the Divine *Understanding*, we imply also [*Immutable*] which respecteth Gods Will: and *Invincible* as to his operation: and had we one word that comprehended these, it would contain our full sense. It is the same thing which our Divines mean by the word [*Irresistible*] or *Insuperable*.

Seventhly, It is [*Certain Persons* or *Individuals*,] that are the objects of this Purpose: which we mention as against the *Arminian Conceit*, that it is *only Believers* in *General*, or *All men Conditionally* if they will Believe, that Christ Decreed to Justifie and Save, without determining infallibly of *any certain Individuals* till he foresaw that themselves would make the difference by Believing.

Eighthly, We call them [*Chosen*] Persons: not *a Posteriore*, upon the foresight of their Faith: but *a priore* before and without any moving cause or condition in themselves: It is the same act which we here call [*Chusing*] as considered in *Eternity*, determining of the future difference of Persons; and which we before call [*Special Intention*,] there considering it as respecting the time of Christ's Death.

Ninthly, The Intended effect is,

1. [*Saving Faith*] such as is not common to the Unjustified. This we express against the Pelagian Conceit, that giveth *Justification* and *Salvation* on condition of *Faith*, but not *Faith it self*, or at least not *Certainly* and *Infallibly* to any: we say, both that *God Decreeth* us to *Faith* as well as to *Salvation by Faith*, and that *Christ dying* did *purpose Infallibly* to bring his

choſen to *Believe*, and this as a fruit of his Death.

2. When we ſpeak of [*Juſtification*] as the ſecond Intended effect, we take it in *Connexion* with the foregoing *Faith*, and ſubſequent Salvation; meaning that all the Elect that are at Age and Believe, and they only, have that Juſtification which follows their perſonal Faith. We own not their opinion that think that many perſons that were never Elected to Salvation, were yet Elected to Faith and Juſtification, and do fall from theſe at laſt and periſh: Tho' yet we reverence many that have maintained or owned this opinion, as precious Servants of God: and think not ſo hardly of their opinion, as of their's who maintain the Apoſtacy of the Elect, if now there be any ſuch. *Auſtin* himſelf ſeems fully to go that way, who yet maintaineth the perſeverance of all the Elect: And ſo doth *Muſculus* and ſome others among the Reformed Divines called *Calviniſts*: But for the *Juſtification of Infants* which hath *no ſuch connexion* to a *perſonal Faith* of their own, whether it may *ceaſe* when they come to the uſe of Reaſon for want of perſonal faith to continue it (which was the Judgment of *Davenant*, Dr. *Ward*, *Amyraldus*, and many of our own) this I intend not here to determine or meddle with.

3. We anumerate *Salvation*, that is, *Glorification*, to theſe intended effects of Chriſt's Death for his choſen, this being the *End* of all the former, and therefore we imply that *Perſeverance* in *Faith*, and a State of Juſtification was intended infallibly and certainly to be given them.

Tenthly,

Tenthly, Obſerve that we do not here enquire after the *preſent immediate effects* of Chriſt's Death as a *ſatisfaction to Juſtice*: For I doubt not but the ſins of the *Non-Elect* did lye upon him, as the *pro meritorious Cauſe* of his Suffering as well as the ſins of the *Elect*, and conſequently that he made *Satisfaction for them* to God, and *purchaſed them* by his Blood.

Eleventh and Laſtly, Obſerve, that in affirming this *Infallible, Immutable, purpoſe of God*, to ſave his *Elect* and *them only*, we do not deny his *Purpoſe of giving Pardon and Life in Chriſt Conditionally* to thoſe that are *not Elect*: For that which he hath done in *Time*, he *Purpoſed before Time* (and ſo did Chriſt at his Death.) But in *Time* he hath *made* ſuch a *general Conditional Grant or Gift of Chriſt and Life*, (as is legible in the Goſpel beyond all exceptions,) *Ergo, &c.* And therefore according to his *(Legiſlative Will, antecedently, God would have all men to be ſaved*; tho' *conſequently* conſidering many as *finally Impenitent Unbelievers*, he *Wills* as a *Righteous Judge*, their *Damnation*. Nor will I diſpute, whether as we aſcribe a *Volition* to God as the cauſe of his *Effectual Grace*; ſo we may aſcribe a *Velleity* to him (as *Lud. Crocius* and other of our Divines do) as the cauſe of that *Grace* which proveth *not-effectual*: in both, ſpeaking of him from the manner of man.

Upon this very curſory explication, I proceed to prove the *Theſis*, thus,

Argum. I. *If Chriſt Died with a Special Intention to bring his choſen Infallibly to Believe, and to give them Juſtification and Glorification on condition of believing, then he died with a ſpecial Intention*

tention of bringing infallibly certain chosen persons, to Faith, Justification and Salvation. But the Antecedent is true, therefore so is the consequent.

That which we have to prove therefore is, that he had a *Special Intent* to *give Faith* to some Infallibly, and then there will be no more question of *Justification and Glorification.* And that I prove thus.

Whatever Grace Christ giveth absolutely and infallibly, that he purposed before to give absolutely and infallibly. But Christ giveth the Grace of Faith (and Repentance) to his chosen (and them only) absolutely and infallibly. Ergo, &c.

By [*giving*] in this Argument I mean, the *actual Causation* or *Collation* of *faith it self*, and not *merely a Legal giving* a *right* to it, of which anon.

The *Major* I think. no sober Christian will deny. For how can the *Omniscient, Immutable God*, be suddenly surprized with a new purpose which never came into his mind before our being Believers?

The *Minor* is proved 1. From the *visible Event.* 2. From *Scripture.*

1. We see *undeniably* that some men *have Faith*, and others *have not:* therefore we know that God giveth it absolutely and infallibly to those only.

Obj *God gave it to all alike, but the rest refused it.*

Answ. I. If that were true of God's *Moral Civil* way of *giving*, yet it *cannot* be true of his *Physical gift* or *operation* which we now speak of:

of: for *that giving* is ever connexed with *receiving*: As God never giveth a *Soul* to *any Body*, nor *health* to any *Sick man*, but those that *receive them*, so he never thus *gives Faith, Repentance, a New-heart, to any* but those that *receive* them.

Obj. *He offereth Christ and Grace to believe in him to All: and offering is conditional giving: and he doth no more to any, but on supposition of their Reception, or performance of the Condition.*

Answ. I. It's false, that he *actually offers Christ to all*, tho' as to the *tenour of the Gift* he doth, which without the *Promulgation* (which extends not to Millions of Heathens) is no *actual offer*.

II. Much less, or as little, doth he offer them *Faith*.

III. It's false, that he *doth no more but offer Faith conditionally* to his *chosen*: For he *effecteth* it absolutely. To [*offer Conditionally*] is a *Civil act*, and we are speaking of a *Physical Causing*: This objection therefore flatly denieth that God is the Author of any man's Faith.

We therefore prove it out of Scripture, *Eph.* 2. 8. *By Grace ye are saved through Faith, and that not of your selves, it is the gift of God.* The Expositors that are most against the Doctrine which I defend, do confess that it is *Faith*, (and not *Salvation* only) that is here called, *the Gift of God*; but they say, *God giveth it, by giving the object, Christ and the Gospel. Answ.* That is somewhat *towards the giving of Faith*, but that

is

is not the *giving of Faith*, if there be no more. Do theſe men think that the unrenewed faculty hath need of *no Grace* but an *object* or *perſwaſion* from without, to cauſe it *to believe*? Many have the *Goſpel* that have not *Faith*: therefore God hath not *cauſed* ſuch to *believe*.

1 Pet. 1. 5. *Who are kept by the Power of God, through Faith unto Salvation.* God's *Power* is exerciſed in *keeping* us in *Faith* as the *means* to *Salvation* the *end*: And he that by his mighty Power keeps us in Faith, no doubt did cauſe it.

2 Pet. 1. 3. *According as his Divine Power hath given to us all things that pertain to Life and Godlineſs, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to Glory and Virtue.* If he give us *all things pertaining to Life*, then he gives us Faith.

Obj. *Faith is expreſly excepted, in the Words* [*through the knowledge of him that hath called us*] *that is, through our own believing.*

Anſw. I. It is diſtinguiſhed from the reſt, as a *Gift* which is a *means* to the *other gifts*, but not excepted.

II. Our *following acts* of *Faith* ſeem to be included in the [*All things*] here mentioned, *viz. Through our firſt believing God giveth us Chriſt, the Spirit, and all following Grace.* And if the following acts of Faith are the gifts of God, then no doubt the firſt was ſo, which was required of us when we were leſs able of our ſelves to perform it, then when we are *Sanctified.*

Heb. 12. 2. *Jeſus is the Author and Finiſher of our Faith.* Obj.

Obj. *That's meant of the Doctrine of our belief, and Objects of Faith; the Christian Religion.*

Answ. I. Then to be the *Finisher* and to be the *Author* would be all one. For as soon as Christ was the *Author* of *Christian Doctrine*, he was the *Finisher*: but not so about our *own Faith.*

II. If it *were so*, yet may it be meant of *Faith* as it contains both, even the whole work of our *Christianity* and *Salvation.*

Phil. 1. 29. *For to you it is given on the behalf of Christ not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake.* From this Text *Grotius* himself confesseth that it is proved that *Faith is the gift of God.*

Joh. 3. 27. *A man can receive nothing except it be given him from Heaven.*

If *nothing*, then *not Faith.* If they say, they *received it not*, the Apostles question may shame them. *What hast thou which thou hast not received?*

Obj. *That's meant of gifts that were for Edification.*

Answ. I. Much more of Faith, which is a special Grace.

II. It is *General*, implying that we *have nothing that we received not*, that thence he might conclude [*Therefore not such Gifts.*]

Joh. 6. 44. *No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him*, ver. 65. Therefore said I unto *you*, *No man can come unto me except it were given to him of my Father.*

Obj.

Obj. God drawing Morally those *that will not follow him.*

Answ. I. The *Drawing* here mentioned is the same with [*giving to come to him.*]

II. It is given as the Reason why *some Believed not*, because *none can come* except it be *given them*, and they be *drawn*. Those that *believed not* had your *Moral drawing* which was *uneffectual*, but it is evident, they had not the *drawing* which Christ mentioneth.

Luk. 17. 5. *Lord increase our Faith.* Therefore he must *give* it.

Obj. *That is a Faith of Miracles.*

Answ. Saving Faith is as much Gods Gift as that: and the Soul as unapt to it till he give it.

Mark 9. 24. *Lord I believe: help thou mine Unbelief.* He that must *Help* our *Unbelief*, that is, *give us more Faith*, must *help our total Unbelief*, by *giving* us our *first Faith*, which we are most unable to perform of our selves.

Gal. 5. 22. *The fruit of the Spirit is Love, Faith*, &c.

Obj. *That's meant of Fidelity.*

Answ. I. That's unproved; that it's *only* meant of that.

II. If common fidelity must be wrought by the Spirit, much more *Saving Faith in Christ.*

To all these it's further objected, that *God giveth*

giveth Faith equally to All, that is, his help to Believe: but it is only the *Materia Diſpoſita that receiveth it*, and the reaſon why *ſome* have it *not*, is becauſe they are *not diſpoſed* or prepared.

Anſ. 1. If this be ſo, that this is the Reaſon of his *denying* faith to *ſome*, yet the *contrary diſpoſition* is not the *Reaſon* of his *giving faith* to *others*. And therefore the *Undiſpoſedneſs* is only a *Reaſon ſufficient* to *Juſtifie God's denial* of Grace, but not *Diſabling* him to *give* it, or *neceſſitating* him to *deny* it. Elſe all men ſhould periſh, who are *undiſpoſed* unleſs they *diſpoſe* themſelves. And this is plain *Semi-Pelagianiſm*, that Grace is tyed to ſuch Diſpoſitions of our own.

2. Prove if you can that ever God hath made a Promiſe of Faith, to men on condition of any prerequiſite Diſpoſitions. I find no ſuch thing in the Word.

3. Are thoſe *Diſpoſitions Gods Gifts* or not? If not, then all is ultimately reſolved into *mans will*, and we have *ſomething* that we *have not received*. If they be, then they are given *Abſolutely* or *Conditionally*. If *Abſolutely*, then they are not ſo given to *All*, elſe *All* ſhould *have them* and ſo *Believe*. If *Conditionally*;

1. What is the *Condition*? They ſay our *Non-reſiſtance*: But our *Reſiſtance* is either *Habitual* or *Actual*. The *Actual* is our *Actual Nilling*; The *Habitual* is our *Habitual Unwillingneſs*, *Deadneſs*, &c. Muſt we cure all this of our ſelves, before God will give us Faith? I will not ſay as Dr. *Twiſſe*, that *Non-reſiſtance* is *Credere*, that is, *Faith it ſelf* that is the contrary to this Reſiſtance or Unwillingneſs; becauſe you may tell me, that to be *unwilling of Chriſt as offered*,

and

and to be *Unwilling that God ſhould make me willing of Chriſt, or give me Faith*, by the means of my hearing, is not all one. But this I ſay, that the *beſt did reſiſt* and were *unwilling* both of *Chriſt and Faith*, till God did overcome their Reſiſtance. And that God hath not promiſed Faith on condition of mans Non-reſiſtance that I know of.

2. Is this *Non-reſiſtance* or *Willingneſs* to *Believe* the *Gift* of God or not? If not, then we have ſomewhat which we did not receive, and then all Grace ſtill is ultimately reſolved (with the *Pelagians*) into mans will; and man makes himſelf to differ, which I diſproved in the laſt days Exerciſe. If it be *Gods Gift*, then either *Abſolute* (and ſo proper to *ſome:*) Or *Conditional*, and then that muſt have a *Condition*; and ſo *in infinitum*, till you ſtop in ſome *Abſolute Gift* not common to all.

Object. *God is not the total, but partial Cauſe, and therefore he doth* quantum in ſe *give Faith to all, and that ſome are yet without it, is long of themſelves.*

Anſw. I. I confeſs that it is long of themſelves that any are Unbelievers.

II. Though man believe, yet it ſeems to me that God is not to be called *Cauſa partialis*, but *totalis* in that Supream Cauſality which he exerciſeth.

III. That God doth *quantum in ſe* give all men Faith, may be underſtood either,

1. *Quantum in ſe quoad potentiam, as much as he can:* But that's Blaſphemy.

2. *Quantum*

2. *Quantum in se quoad Decentiam, as much as is meet for him to do.* But who dare say that it is *unmeet* for God to give men such effectual grace as shall *Infallibly cause* them to *Believe?* He giveth such to his Elect, and therein doth not any thing that is *unmeet.*

3. Or else it is meant, that God giveth so much help to unbelievers, as leaves all the *blame of their unbelief* upon themselves, and justifieth him from being the *culpable deficient* or *efficient Cause:* And this I grant, but this is no advantage to the Adversary. But I have been too long on this first Argument.

Arg. II. *Jesus Christ dying intended the Infallible Glorification of Gods free grace in the certain Regeneration, Justification and Glorification of certain men, therefore he intended the infallible certain Regeneration (or Faith) and Justification and Glorification of those men*

That Christ came into the World with a *certain intention* to accomplish the *glorifying of God* as *his end;* is undoubted. For to say either that he undertook so great a work *without an end,* or that the *glory of Gods grace and love* was *not* that *end,* are both impious. And as certain is it that it was the glory of Gods *grace in* the *certain Salvation of some* men that was *intended.* For as there is *no other way* of this *full glorification* of Gods *grace,* manifested to us, but only by *mans Salvation,* so the Scripture most frequently tells us that *this is the way,* and this *was God's design,* and therefore Christ is stiled *the Saviour,* which certainly implyeth that he hath *some infallibly to save,* and that he came to *seek and to save*

that which was lost. And if it were not the Salvation of *Determinate Persons* that God intended to glorify himself in, then was it not in the *Salvation of any man at all*: for *all Salvation* is *some ones Salvation. Accidents* exist not without a *Subject.* And if it were not a *certain obtaining* of *this end by this means* that Christ intended, then Christ came upon an *uncertain errand* into the World, and intended not the *certain attainment* of Gods glory herein, which is unreasonable to imagine. So admirably was this design of Redemption laid, such a wonderous Mystery is it to Angels and Men, that it is apparent God intended infallibly the attaining of his blessed ends thereby. And so precious was the blood of Jesus Christ, that it is impious to imagine that he had no certain end in the shedding of it, or that it might have been lost as to the glory of Gods grace, and the Salvation of any persons, for any thing that he intended to the contrary.

Arg. III. *What Christ intended from all Eternity, that he intended in dying* (which was yet future) *but Christ did from all Eternity intend the certain justificati n and glorification of his Chosen, and giving them faith to that end, therefore he intended it on the Cross, and at his undertaking.*

This Argument divolves the whole Controversie to the point of *Predestination*, where it is plain that it lyeth, which because our Divines have fully vindicated, I will now pass by.

Arg. IV. *God hath made an absolute Promise that he will infallibly Convert, Pardon and save some,* viz. his Chosen,) *which he hath not made concerning*

concerning others, therefore he intended the certain Converſion, Remiſſion, and Salvation of thoſe ſome, and not of others (in giving Chriſt, and ſo did Chriſt in giving his Life.)

Jer. 31. 33. *This is my Covenant, &c. I will put my Law in their minds, and write it in their hearts, and I will be their God, and they ſhall be my People. So I will take the hard heart out of their body, and give them an heart of fleſh, a new heart, one heart, &c. And I will put my fear into their hearts that they ſhall not depart from me.* Such Promiſes are not *to all*, nor *Conditional*: If they are, *what is the Condition*? Now what God *Promiſeth*, he *Performeth*, and *intended* to Perform.

Arg. V. *If Chriſt intended not the certain Converſion, Juſtification, and Glorification of his Choſen, more than of others, then thoſe in Heaven are no more beholden to his intention or his death, than thoſe in Hell, nor the Regenerate, than the Unregenerate. But the Conſequent is intollerable, therefore ſo is the Antecedent.* At leaſt it will follow that they are no more beholden to him, for *their Faith*, than they that never had it.

Arg. VI. *Either God Purpoſed* (*in giving his Son, and Chriſt in dying*) *the certain Salvation* (and ſo *Converſion*) *of All, of None*, or *of Some only*. Not *of All*, for then *All ſhould* be *Saved*. Not of *None*, for then either *None ſhould* be *Saved*, or elſe they ſhould be *Saved without* or *againſt Gods Purpoſe*. Not *againſt it*, as will be acknowledged. *Not without it*, for,

1. He who *Saveth them* in *Time*, *Purpoſed* it from *Eternity*, *for he worketh all things after the counſel of his own Will*.

2. He whose *Providence* extendeth to the *falling of a Sparrow*, and the *cloathing of the Grass*, doth sure *provide* and *regard* the Salvation of Mankind, and saveth not man without his *own purpose to save him.*

3. If it be a *Performed Act*, and not a *Purposed Act*, for God to Convert and Save, then it would be either an *Irrational Act* which had *no end*, or else *that* purpose must be *new* in him, which was not at *Christs dying*; both which are *intolerable.*

If they say that he *purposed it Conditionally*, or *quantum in se*, determining *nothing Absolutely* of the Event, I have answered enough to that before.

Arg. VII. *Ad hominem:* The Adversaries grant in effect the substance of our Conclusion; for,

1. They grant, *That God Infallibly decreed to Save all that would believe, &c.*

2. *That God knew from Eternity who would Believe, and who not*, and that *Christ knew this at his undertaking to dye*, and *at his death.*

3. They grant that *he doth not absolutely purpose the saving of any other.*

4. They grant, *That as Christ dyed not from Eternity*, so we are to look on him as *undertaking to dye for us, and entring* upon the *Mediatory work*, not *from Eternity* (upon his meer decree,) but *presently upon Mans fall*, when the *Promise was made*: for the *Relation* and *Extrinsical Denomination* might then begin, tho' no *new Act* of Gods Will.

Lay all this together, that God resolved to save *all Believers*, and knew each of them by name that would believe, and who would not, and

and intended to ſave no other than Believers, and that *after this* Chriſt *undertook* and *performed* the *ſatisfaction by his death*; and I think, the main that we plead for is granted, as to the *Intent of Chriſt unfallibly to juſtifie*, and *ſave ſome determinate Perſons on'y*. Nor can they deny this with any modeſty, in conſiſtency with their conceſſions.

But then its true, that they yield not that he *Intended* the *giving of Faith infallibly and Abſolutely* to *ſome only*, becauſe they ſay, he intended not *ſo to give it to any*. but only offer them ſufficient help to believe, and leave it to their own wills whether to make it effectual or to fruſtrate it: And withal they ſay, that it was upon the *foreſight* that *ſome would Believe*, and *others not*, that he intended the Salvation of ſome determinate Perſons, and condemnation of others.

But having ſpoke to this already, I only now add,

1. Yet ſtill this grants that *Chriſt dyed with a ſpecial intent of ſaving thoſe determinate Perſons and them only*, tho' they ſuppoſe this *Intent* to be upon a *foreſight* of their *own Faith*, or *Unbelief*.

2. I demand whether *God could not* without wrong to any of his Attributes, have *cauſed* thoſe to *Believe*, whom he *foreſaw* would *be Unbelievers*, and ſo having *decreed* to *cauſe them* to *believe* as well *as others*, have *foreſeen* that *they would Believe*. They that dare ſay, *God could not have given any ſuch Unbeliever Grace to Believe* (infallibly,) do moſt audaciouſly abuſe Gods power, goodneſs, and wiſdom.

3. And doth not God *do more* for *Peter*, than for *Judas*, for the *Elect* than the *Reprobate*, antecedently to their Faith? all the *Arminians* are not bold enough to deny it.

4. *Arminius* himself grants, that after the abuse and rejecting of grace, God gives up some, as *Pharaoh*, *Ahab* &c. to *fill up the measure of their sin*, and penally forsakes them; and I think they will grant that some others *as bad* are *not so forsaken* nor given up, but *Converted*, as *Manasseh*.

And if God shew this undeserved Mercy to a *Manasseh*, which he denyeth to a *Pharaoh*, is it not his *free grace* that makes *Manasseh to differ*? And if God may do so in one, why not in others?

Lastly, The Schoolmen, and most Papists will acknowledge, that *Christ dyed for all men as to the sufficiency of his death, and for some men only efficiently*; that is, to effect some mens Salvation.

And doth not this grant that he *dyed not for all alike*, and that he had a *special intent* of *Saving some*, which he had not as to *others*.

We easily grant that he hath *effected satisfaction for all*, but he that *intended only* the Saving of *Believers*, could not *intend* to save those Persons actually by his death, who he *knew* would *not believe*, but perish in *unbelief*.

From these Reasons we proceed to some from particular Texts of Scripture.

First, John 17. 2. *As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give Eternal Life*

Life to as many as thou hast given him. Here Christs *Authority* as *Redemer* is said to be *over all flesh*, and so *all are* his *purchased ones*; but the *purpose* of giving *actually Eternal Life*, is expresly restrained to those that are specially *given him* by the Father.

Object. *By Giving is not meant absolute Electing from Eternity, but giving them by Vocation to Christ as true Disciples.*

Answ. Suppose that be so:

1. That *Giving* them to be true Disciples, can import no less than God's *making them Disciples*, that is, *Believers:* And so it is not Man that *gives himself to Christ primarily*, or makes himself a *Believer*: And God makes not *all Disciples*, which he could do if he pleased.

2. And if God give men to Christ by effectual Vocation in time, then no doubt he decreed so to do from Eternity.

Secondly, Eph. 1. 22, 23. *And hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the Church.*

Here the intent of God in *giving Christ*, is expressed to be, that *he might be the head over all*, but not the *Head of All*, but *of the Church only.* And it is he that makes his Church, and not the Church itself principally.

Thirdly, John 10. 15. *I lay down my Life for the sheep*, which implyeth that it is laid down with a *special intent* for them, more than for *others.*

Object. *The Sheep are Believers*, undeterminate as to *Individuals*.

Answ. 1. Men are *Believers before* Christ's *Pardoning* of them, but not *before* Christ's *laying down his Life for them*; nor so considered; else the Act of Faith should be before, and without its *Object*.

2. It's confessed that *God knew* who the Persons were that would believe; therefore his purpose was of determinate Individuals.

Fourthly, Tit. 2. 14. *Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purifie to himself a peculiar People, zealous of good works.*

1. If he did not intend to purifie *every man*, and make them *zealous of good works* (eventually,) then he intended this much *more to his chosen* than to *others*. But, *&c. Ergo, &c.*

2. If he intended the separating of some as a *peculiar* people, from others, then he dyed not with equal Intentions to all. But, *&c. Ergo, &c.*

Fifthly, John 11. 51, 52. *He Prophecied that Jesus should dye for that Nation, and not for that Nation only, but that also he should gather together in one, the Children of God that were scattered abroad.* Here is expressed a peculiar intention of *gathering God's Children*, which was not of others.

Object. *God's Children are Believers.*

Answ. 1. It seems rather, that they are called *Children*, because they are decreed to be actually Children, and will be such: (and not as *Grotius* of

of them, and of the Sheep, *Joh.* 10. 16. as if it were from ſome diſpoſition of mind, antecedent to Faith.)

2. However ſtill it is *Determinate Individuals*, elſe it were indeed none at all.

Sixthly, Acts 13.48 *And as many as were ordained to Eternal Life believed.* The wriglings and ſhiftings of thoſe that would pervert this Text, and their new deviſed ſtrained expoſitions of the word [*Ordained*] I ſhall not now ſtand to detect and confute.

Seventhly, The inſtances of the Converſion of *Manaſſeh*, *Paul*, the *Thief* on the Croſs, and other particular Sinners, do plainly tell us that Faith and Converſion proceedeth from God's differencing grace, *Acts* 26. 16. & 22. 14. *Paul was called, becauſe firſt choſen.* So *Rom.* 8. 30. *Whom he predeſtinated, them he called*, &c.

But in the Concluſion, I muſt ſay, that even in this point of notable difference between the Remonſtrants, and the Contra-remonſtrants, the difference is not ſo great as ſome imagine or pretend. It is confeſſed by the underſtanding ſort on both ſides, that Chriſt at his death had a ſpecial intention to bring certain individual perſons to a ſtate of Juſtification and Salvation. But then they ſay that this was only upon the foreſight of their believing: yea, ſome of them ſay that God purpoſed to give the grace of Faith to ſome individuals only, but they ſay that it was upon the foreſight of their non-reſiſtance, or of their voluntary diſpoſedneſs to receive it, or of their right uſe of former preparing grace; ſo that the ſame decree, as to theſe gifts, is confeſſed on both ſides; and it cannot be denyed but that the

foreſight

foresight which they presuppose is from *Eternity*, and therefore Mans fall, or Christs Mediatorship; and that there is no priority or posteriority of *Time* between the *foreknowledge* and the *Decree*, but only in *Nature*: And then it is commonly confessed that though *Knowledge* and *Will* in Man are two things, yet in God they are but *one*; and are only distinguished *denominatione extrinseca* by Man for the accommodation of his narrow imperfect apprehension. Therefore (though) I confess that a difference still remaineth, yet let it not be thought to be greater than it is.

Yea more, not only many, yea, most of the Schoolmen confess an Absolute Election to Faith, and so to Salvation, and so hold in this the same that we do; but also many of the Jesuites, and Moderate Lutherans and Arminians hold the same, (though not an Absolute Reprobation) which was also *Augustine's*, *Prosper's*, and *Fulgentius's* Opinion. And I have elsewhere yet more contracted this Controversie.

FINIS.

BOOKS Printed for John Salisbury *at the* Rising-Sun *in* Cornhil.

THe End of Doctrinal Controversies which have lately troubled the Churches by reconciling explication without much Disputing.

The Certainty of the Worlds of Spirits, fully Evinced by unquestionable Histories of Apparitions and Witchcrafts, Operations, Voices, *&c.* proving the Immortality of Souls, the malice and misery of the Devils, and Damned, and the blessedness of the Justified; both by Mr. *Richard Baxter.*

The Protestant Religion truly stated and justified by the Late Reverend Divine Mr. *Richard Baxter.* Whereunto is added by way of an Epistle some account of the Learned Author, never before published; by Mr. *Matthew Sylvester*, and Mr. *Daniel Williams.*

The Christians Converse with God, or the insufficiency and uncertainty of Human Friendship, and the improvement of Solitude in Converse with God; with some of the Authors Breathings

Breathings after him; by Mr. *Richard Baxter*, Recommended to the Readers ſerious thoughts when at the Houſe of Mourning and Retirement; by Mr. *Matthew Sylveſter*.

A Plea for Scripture Ordination, or, Ten Arguments from Scripture and Antiquity, proving Ordination by Presbyters without Biſhops to be valid, by *J. Owen*, Miniſter of the Goſpel.

To which is prefix'd an Epiſtle by the Reverend Mr. *Daniel Williams*.

The Harmony of the Divine Attributes in the contrivance and accompliſhment of Mans Redemption by the Lord Jeſus Chriſt; or Diſcourſes, wherein is ſhewed how the Wiſdom, Mercy, Juſtice, Holineſs, Power, and Truth of God are glorified in that great and bleſſed work; by *William Bates*, D. D.

The Chriſtian Laver, or a Diſcourſe opening the Nature of Participation with, and Demonſtrating the Neceſſity of Purification by Chriſt, by *T. Cruſo*——

The Duty and Bleſſing of a Tender Conſcience plainly ſtated, and earneſtly recommended to all that regard acceptance with God, and the proſperity of their Souls, by the ſame Author.

Four Sermons on various Occaſions, by the ſame Author.

Some Paſſages of the Life and Death of the Right Honourable *John* Earl of *Rochester*, written by his own direction on his Death-Bed; by *Gilbert* Lord Biſhop of *Sarum*.

Practical

Practical Reflections on the late Earthquakes in *Jamaica*, *England*, *Sicily*, *Malta*, &c. *Anno* 1692. with a particular Historical Account of those and divers other Earthquakes; by *John Shower*.

Earthquakes explained, and practically improved, occasioned by the Earthquake on *September* the 8*th*, 1692. in *London*, many other parts in *England*, and Beyond-sea; by *Thomas Doolittle*, M. A.

A Practical Discourse of Silence and Submission, shewing that good Men should possess their Souls in patience under the severest Providences, and particularly in the loss of Dear Relations; Preached at St. *Thoma's Hospital Southwark*, by *William Hughes*, Hospitaler there.

The Changeableness of this World, with respect to Nations, Families, and particular Persons, with a practical Application thereof to the various Conditions of this Mortal Life, in a Funeral Discourse occasioned by the Death of Mr. *Edmond Hill*, who dyed *April* 16. 1692. by *Timothy Rogers*, M. A.

The Mourners Memorial in two Sermons on the death of the truly Pious Mrs. *Susanna Soame*, late Wife of *Bartholomew Soame* of *Thurlow*, Esquire, who Deceased *February* the 14*th*, 169¼. With some account of her Life and Death, by *Timothy Wright*, and *Robert Fleming*, Ministers of the Gospel.

Mr. *William Oughtred's* Key of the Mathematicks, newly Translated from the best Edition, with Notes rendring it easie and intelligible to less skillful Readers; in which also some

ſome Problems left unanſwered by the Author are Reſolved; abſolutely neceſſary for all Gaugers, Surveyors, Gunners, Military Officers, Mariners, *&c.* Recommended by Mr. *E. Halley*, Fellow of the Royal Society.

Barbarian Cruelty, being a true Hiſtory of the Diſtreſſed Condition of the Chriſtian Captives, under the Tyranny of *Mully Iſhmael* Emperor of *Morocco*, &c. by *Francis Brooks*.

ERRA-

ERRATA.

PAge 43. l. 3. r. violated. p. 45. l. 4. r. as. p. 129. l. 8. r. foreknown or. p. 139. l. 15. r. to do ſo. p. 157. l. 17. del. not. p. 160. l. 5. r. lovingly. p. 171. l. 18. r. per. p. 198. l. 7. del. the paid. p. 203. l. 29. r. ſummus. p. 224. l. 33. r. converſion [conveſiron.] p. 234. l. 20. r. objecto [objectio.] p. 254. l. 6. r. I am. l. 21. del. but. and l. 22. r. But the puniſhment, &c. p. 303. l. 29. r. ſenſe are. p. 331. l. 24. r. ὑιὸν. p. 338. l. 28. r. effectum. p. 470. l. 2. r. and of the. p. 479. l. 23. r. per.